

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou immortal, invisible, and eternal one, who alone is God, unto Thee be glory and honor for ever and ever. With all our manifold weaknesses and with the consciousness of our transgressions we come to Thee. We thank Thee that Thy strength is for human weakness, that Thy purity is for human sin, and Thy mercy is for human resentment. Fill us with Thy love, the love which springs from a pure heart, from a clear conscience, and from a sincere faith. Enable us not to deviate from these and lose our way in empty reasoning. We would accept and make Thee the outward and unselfish aim of our lives, knowing that the grace of our Lord is more than abundant. Clothe us with a deep sense of our responsibility that we may faithfully and wisely fulfill the mission Thou hast given us.

Hear our prayer for the sake of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3245. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. National Archives.
6. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. National Housing Agency.
9. Office of Temporary Controls.
10. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
11. Selective Service System.
12. Veterans' Administration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3245) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

THE POTATO MARKET

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I am to speak on a subject which should be approached in a very calm and collected manner, and it is my hope to be calm, but I want to tell you this whole business makes my blood boil.

I hold here in my hand a picture which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, May 18. It is an Associated Press picture. The picture shows a mountain of surplus potatoes, some 50 tons, which were dumped by the Government of the United States on Friday, May 16, because, it is alleged, of a glutted market. Here let me interpolate briefly to point out that the market which is said to be glutted is not the consumer market—for if an adequate supply was permitted to flow, prices would be reduced. The caption under the picture indicates that kerosene was poured over these potatoes

to make them unfit for consumption. There is something lacking to make this picture complete. This picture would be complete if on the top of this mountain of surplus potatoes there appeared such famous advisers as Paul Porter, Chester Bowles, Leon Henderson, Robert Nathan, and Henry Wallace with the Voice of America microphone.

Keep this picture in mind as I show you a sales slip, dated May 12, 1947, indicating that 10 pounds of white potatoes sold for 97 cents right here in Washington. This means that potatoes are selling to the consumer today for nearly \$6 a bushel at the retail level.

Now, gentlemen, these 50 tons of surplus potatoes—and I hesitate to think of how many more tons at other times and places—were bought and paid for by the Government with our taxpayers' money. The kerosene which was poured over them to make them unfit for consumption was poured over them by orders of our Government. Potatoes, as we all know, are one of the most important basic food items in the United States and throughout the world. With this in mind, I want to know how in good conscience and sincerity can any representative or spokesman for the present administration even so much as mention the high cost of living?

As we think of these tons of life-giving food being destroyed here in the United States, thus preventing this food from getting into the hands of people who need it, I am wondering how the administration's experts and economists justify our Government's action in view of the starvation situation throughout the world and the heavy demand on our own taxpayers to provide funds to keep body and soul together in many foreign lands?

How can the administration attempt to justify the spending of our taxpayers' money with one hand to destroy food and at the same time with the other hand ask our people to provide millions to feed a starving world?

Yes; let us keep in our mind's eye the picture of these tons of surplus potatoes being destroyed right here in our own country in order to prevent this food from reaching the consumers' market, as we think of the \$31,000,000 being asked to tell a wrecked and starving world about America. Would you like the Voice of America to tell a weak, despairing, and starving people the truth about what we are doing here in the United States? I hope if we have a Voice of America, the voice will be able to tell the truth and not just propaganda. The world is fed up with propaganda. What the world wants is something to eat. Let us give the starving peoples food instead of propaganda. I think the psychological effect of food would be worth a billion dollars of propaganda. Let us convince the world that we really have a great and free system of government here in the United States by reestablishing good American common sense and humanity in the administration of our Government.

There is a lot of talk about communism in the United States. Our taxpayers are being called upon for millions of

dollars, and probably as yet undisclosed billions of dollars, for use throughout the world to prevent the spread of communism. On the other hand, the administration of our Government is spending the taxpayers' money to destroy food which hungry peoples need and which many low-income people in our own country are having great difficulty in buying. It would seem to me that such action as the administration has taken is driving prices still further up by destroying potatoes which are the very essence of life, and creates a most fertile and receptive attitude for the growth of communism.

The farmer wants and is entitled to a full and proper price for his products, and every reasonable person in the United States wants the farmer to have full and proper prices for his products. Think for a minute, however, how the farmers must feel who put their labor and sweat into raising these potatoes only to have them destroyed by their own Government with their own tax money.

This particular incident is just one example of the type of government manipulation which fosters our high cost of living and which compelled me to introduce sometime ago a resolution calling for an over-all study of the cost of living. I am fully convinced now of the urgency and necessity of studying this problem with a view to overhauling the administration of our Government in order that it might in deed as well as in word aid toward the recovery in both the domestic and foreign situations.

I ask the Members of this House if in light of the high cost of living, in light of a starving world, in view of the tremendous tax burden on our people, in view of our fight against communism, in view of the administration's verbal attacks on the high cost of living, do you know of any sound reason why potatoes should at this time be destroyed as surplus when there exists so great a need for them for consumption?

I hope in view of this situation that our Appropriations Committee and all other committees of this Congress will renew vigorous efforts to reestablish good, old American common sense and humanity in the administration of our Government.

THE CONDITION OF THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, some friends of mine came down from New York on a visit not so long ago and climbed the steps to the Capitol dome. They told me that what they saw up there is not pleasant to hear about. So a few days ago I climbed those same steps myself all the way up to the dome of the Capitol. I realize what I found up there is the accumulation of many past years but it should be corrected. There are all kinds of comments written and scribbled on the walls in red paint, lipstick, pencil marks, pens, knife markings, and other

ways, indicating various things and also that other people were there besides Kilroy. At one place where a person has to go out into the open air on the trek up it is plain to see that over the last number of years the pigeons have not been very cooperative. The condition of the hand rails is a disgrace and the accumulation of filth is really terrible. You will find that the dust and grime has lain up at the dome for many years, and you can actually with your fingers make visible inscriptions in the dust and grime.

I think that situation ought to be corrected. It is a desecration of the Capitol and is something that cannot be condoned. I think once it is cleaned up we ought to put a few signs up there calling attention to the fact that it is a crime to deface public buildings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from the National Small Businessmen's Association, and in the other to include an address by Hon. Robert E. Freer, a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPEECH OF ANDREI GROMYKO

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Andrei Gromyko before the American Russian Institute in New York last night, as reported in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, is one of diplomatic double talk.

The Soviet delegate insists that Russia cannot relinquish her right of veto over decisions taken by an international control authority. At the same time, he states that the Soviet Union "has stood and does stand for strict international control of atomic energy." He also talks of outlawing of the atomic bomb and other weapons of mass destruction. Where there is a veto there is no law. Where there is a veto there can be no strict control. The American plan of abolishing the veto in atomic matters is a step toward effective world law in atomic matters. Russia desires to be beyond the law. Gromyko talks of interference with Russian sovereignty by international inspection. Of course, an international inspection would interfere with Russian sovereignty the same as it would interfere with the sovereignty of the United States or any other country. If we are to have an effective world law

with regard to the atom bomb, no nation should be above that law.

The Soviet delegate speaks against investigation of so-called Russian peaceful production of atomic energy. The peaceful production of atomic power could be changed to warlike production by an act of the will. The same atomic power that could drive a locomotive across a continent could drive a missile across an ocean.

The insistence of Mr. Gromyko that before effective controls are set up a conference be first called for the prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of destruction is perhaps a rather clever attempt to force the United States first to display to Russia all of our weapons before an effective world control is established. I do not think that any American would be fooled, however, by the Russian suggestion that the United States first lay all of its modern weapons on the counter before any laws would be established to control the use of those weapons by other countries.

The United States has shown every evidence of good faith with regard to the outlawing of these weapons that would destroy a large part of civilization.

The Russians speak of scientific development. In fact, the whole Russian idea of government is one of so-called scientific materialism. Lenin and Marx disavowed spiritual values. They disavowed morals. But science has no morals.

Scientists have given us the power to split the atom. Statesmen should give us the power to unite the world under effective laws that govern all nations.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to correct what I believe is an injustice to the States of this Nation as a result of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Bethlehem Steel case, in which the State labor relations boards are completely ousted of jurisdiction in all dispute and representation cases.

In my own State, for example, the National Labor Relations Board never assumed jurisdiction of the famous Allis-Chalmers strike, which has handled completely by the State board and handled so successfully that the National Board never sought to acquire jurisdiction.

In the amendment which I am proposing, the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board is maintained, but concurrent jurisdiction is given to the States, and they will not be ousted of jurisdiction except in those cases where the National Board elects to assume full jurisdiction. In other words, a State body may in many cases assume jurisdiction and decide the issue without the necessity of intervention by the National Labor Relations Board.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the Italian Treaty, Dorothy Thompson says:

I would be against the Italian Treaty, even if there were a democratic and humane regime in Yugoslavia, because the treaty is unjust, stupid, cruel, dangerous, and in violation of our solemn promises. Why must we aid and defend Greece against the same regime to which we open Italy? Is it because the Government of Greece is more democratic than that of today's Italy? If we approve this treaty, there will not long be a government either democratic or friendly to us in Italy. The harsh terms of the Italian Treaty is no way to stop communism.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on bringing that statement to the attention of the House. I agree with every word of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions of the Mission on Christian Social Relations of the diocese of New York.

REMEMBER-DISABLED-VETERANS MONTH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part thereof a bill which I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to introduce a resolution by the Disabled American Veterans which authorizes the President of the United States to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month.

It will cost no money. I think it is a very fine measure. It will bring to people's memory the sacrifices of the men who have done so much for us. There are many things that can be done for the men today that are not being done. Many things for the benefit of the veterans could be sent to the hospitals. First-class entertainers could be sent to the hospitals. In the war great stars entertained the soldiers. They could entertain them today. Many veterans could be given employment. Many could be given housing.

This resolution will have a very salutary effect and will do a great deal for our disabled veterans, who certainly deserve it. During the war it was "the soldiers come first." In peace the dis-

abled must come first. People so soon forget. It is remembering that counts.

A copy of the resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 204

(By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts by request)

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, a veterans' organization chartered by Congress to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, has designated the month of June as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month; and

Whereas the observance of such month of June as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month is a highly desirable objective, designed to enlist the wholehearted cooperation of American organizations and individuals in the Disabled American Veterans' program for all of America's war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas it is the patriotic duty and moral responsibility of all Americans to take an active interest in the care and rehabilitation of the Nation's war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas Americans cannot afford to permit lethargy, apathy, or indifference to dull the public's consciousness of the interests and welfare of our war-disabled veterans; and

Whereas an important factor in providing security for America is for America to provide security for its own citizens, and particularly for its disabled veterans of the past, as well as of the future; and

Whereas America can always feel assured that it will be enthusiastically protected and defended so long as America remembers to protect and defend its protectors and defenders: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested annually, to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month, with appropriate ceremonies in honor of America's war-disabled veterans and, wherever possible by:

(1) Reviewing the nature and extent of benefits provided for America's war-disabled veterans by the Federal Government and the various State, county, and municipal governments, and the adequacy of the administration and application of such beneficial laws.

(2) Increasing and facilitating the opportunities for suitable and gainful employment for all of America's employable disabled veterans.

(3) Cooperating in assistance to war-disabled veterans in readjusting themselves to civilian life.

HELPING THEM TO HELP THEMSELVES

"Organized in 1920, the Disabled American Veterans is a congressionally chartered organization of American citizens who were wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled as a result of their honorable service in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it, during time of war. The purpose of the Disabled American Veterans is to restore, as far as possible, war-disabled veterans to as good a position as they would have enjoyed had they not been disabled, and to make them better and happier citizens, through sympathetic understanding and comradely assistance in solving their problems. Toward this end the Disabled American Veterans endeavors to secure fair and just compensation, adequate and sympathetic medical care, and honest and profitable employment for those who are employable." (From the United States Government issued Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II and their Dependents.)

Purpose of the Disabled American Veterans, as set forth in its congressional charter:

"To uphold and maintain the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible for membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and disabled veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of wounded, injured, or disabled veterans * * *; to stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all wounded, injured, or disabled veterans; to serve our comrades, our communities, and our country; and to encourage in all people that spirit of understanding which will guard against future wars."

DAV SERVICE IS NATION-WIDE

National Headquarters, Disabled American Veterans, Cincinnati, Ohio.

National Service Headquarters, Disabled American Veterans, Washington, D. C.

National campaign headquarters, National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

National service officers located in all of the Veterans' Administration Hospitals and Regional offices.

Forty-six State departments.

One thousand and five hundred local chapters.

A war is ended officially by Presidential proclamation or congressional resolution. But the rehabilitation problems of the more than 2,500,000 disabled veterans of World War II, and of the handicapped ex-service men of previous wars, will not be solved until as many of these men as possible are made self-supporting.

With the advent of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans quickly realized the tremendous added responsibility which that conflict would bring to the DAV in terms of greatly increased needs for expert, direct, personalized assistance to war-disabled veterans.

1947 OBJECTIVE: "HUMAN RECONVERSION"

World War I experience shows the way

The experience of the DAV since World War I proves that the person best qualified to assist disabled veterans in their rehabilitation problems is a fellow disabled veteran, especially if he is expertly trained. All DAV service workers are disabled veterans. All have undergone intensive academic and on-the-job training. Gen. Omar N. Bradley states that "these service workers are eminently qualified to give their fellow disabled veterans the necessary sympathetic care and understanding."

In line with the mandate in its congressional charter, and with the full cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, the DAV two years ago put into effect a comprehensive plan to expand its service program. The initial step was the training of 400 disabled veterans of World War II, to augment the national service worker set-up which the DAV had built up during the past 25 years and which was already the largest service set-up exclusively for disabled veterans.

Widespread support enlisted

This service expansion program was presented to the public and attracted widespread leadership and support. More than 16,000 individuals and corporations contributed toward the training of additional service workers, so that the needs of World War II disabled veterans could be met.

Because of this support, the DAV has been able to shoulder its large share of responsibility in connection with the initial phases of World War II rehabilitation work. The DAV has greatly facilitated the work of the Veterans' Administration and has been of inestimable help to disabled veterans as their

advocate in the preparation and presentation of their claims for benefits to which they are entitled under the law, such as medical treatment, hospitalization, disability compensation, insurance, etc.

1947 service needs must be met

The great task ahead is that of helping disabled veterans to complete their transition to useful civilian life. Every possible assistance must be given to bring about their placement in suitable, gainful employment. To accomplish this, the DAV has put into effect a national employment plan, coordinated on the national, state and local levels.

Large numbers of disabled veterans will require service and assistance of various kinds over a period of years.

The "peak service load" for disabled veterans of World War I was not reached until 1939. It is estimated that the service volume for World War II disabled veterans will reach its maximum around 1960.

The Disabled American Veterans, chartered by Congress to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration, is particularly qualified and equipped to handle the problems of these men, from the time they leave the hospital until they have been placed in suitable jobs.

An annual, united campaign

To take care of the continuing needs for specialized services to war-disabled veterans, the DAV conducts one united campaign each year to meet its budget on national, state and local levels.

1947 appeal is now under way

The money is being raised under the leadership of outstanding Americans throughout the country and the fund will be expended under their supervision.

On or before the first day of January in each year, the DAV makes and transmits to Congress a report of its activities for the preceding fiscal year, including a complete statement of receipts and disbursements, audited by an outstanding firm of certified public accountants.

From the New York Sunday Times of October 27, 1946:

"On a recent visit to the Capital, Mr. Lloyd F. Oleson, National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, caused a profound and almost startling impression among high-ranking public officials when he told them that he opposed any form of bonus to veterans, and that the objective of the DAV was to get as many disabled veterans off the pension rolls and onto pay rolls as was humanly possible.

"Furthermore, the DAV under his leadership has begun a successful effort to help private industry fit disabled veterans into jobs which the individual members can do as well as they could if they were able-bodied.

"The DAV unanimously elected Mr. Oleson as national commander in recognition of his strenuous campaign to get the disabled veteran recognized as a productive citizen rather than a ward of the Government."

Lloyd F. Oleson, national commander of the DAV, served in many battles as a captain with the First Armored Division, in Ireland, England, north Africa, and Italy. He received serious injury to his back while in combat.

He was awarded the Purple Heart with three clusters, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Service Cross. He was the first disabled veteran of World War II to receive the Distinguished Service Cross in the European Theater, and was the first veteran of mandership of a major veterans organization, that war to be elected to the national command.

A graduate of the University of Illinois, he is an attorney and former manager of the Ventura (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce.

"The DAV is not appealing for your sympathy nor to your patriotism, but is presenting a practical plan for making useful, independent citizens of our disabled veterans. It is to be commended for its excellent work."

(Robert R. Watson, past president, National Association of Manufacturers.)

"General Motors' experience has demonstrated that successfully placed handicapped workers cease to be handicapped from the standpoint of earnings and productivity." (H. W. Anderson, vice president, General Motors Corp.)

"No man at the Ford Motor Co. is disabled . . . there are 6,286 men and women who are physically limited . . . all of them have handicaps similar to those we find in many returning veterans . . . every one of these employees does a full day's work . . . receives a full day's pay . . . their absenteeism and accident rate are considerably lower than those of other employees. No jobs were created for them. Instead they were fitted to the job." (Henry Ford II.)

"Our experience indicates that industry as a whole is missing a grand opportunity to get some real good, willing, honest, and ambitious people in their organization if they fail to participate in a program for the rehabilitation of returned veterans." (C. B. Masters, horological superintendent, Gruen Watch Co.)

"The disabled have earned the right to work by the record they have made . . . we in America possess the knowledge and vast resources to create the abundant life for all men, well or ill—whole or maimed . . . it is time to put this knowledge to work to bring to our own communities the services and opportunities which will enable the handicapped to share equally in the common benefits, the common goals, and responsibilities of life in this democracy." (Howard A. Rusk, M. D., the New York Times magazine.)

COORDINATED PROGRAM OF SERVICE

The DAV service program is designed to help disabled veterans to help themselves. Coordinated on the national, state and local levels, it provides expert, personalized assistance, free of charge, to all war-disabled veterans and their dependents.

The DAV is more than an advisory and referral agency. It is a "one-stop" organization, rendering a complete service to handicapped ex-servicemen. It actually takes over the problems of disabled veterans in need of assistance and does all the work necessary for their solution.

Ninety percent of all disabled veterans are capable of working at gainful employment. And they are eager to work. The aim of the DAV is to help them to make as complete a transition as possible to productive civilian life. Experience has shown that the best way to maintain the morale and self-respect of disabled veterans is to help them to become self-supporting through gainful employment.

On the three levels, the DAV's services to disabled veterans include:

National

Advice and assistance in connection with their claims for governmental benefits, such as disability compensation, hospitalization, insurance, vocational training, and employment.

The objective is to make disabled veterans productive assets to their families, their employers, their communities, and their country.

The DAV's services on the national level are furnished through its Nation-wide set-up of expertly trained National Service Workers, located in all of the Veterans' Administration regional offices throughout the country.

These service workers, all disabled veterans, are devoting their lives to the service of their fellow disabled veterans.

¹ The training course consists of 6 months of intensive study at the American University in Washington, D. C., followed by 18 months of on-the-job training.

State

State departments of the DAV cooperate with national service headquarters, principally in connection with the DAV's employment efforts to "find the man to fit the job, or the job to fit the man."

Each State department has appointed a State employment officer. He in turn has selected, and cooperates closely with, the employment officer of each chapter in his State.

On the State level, the DAV cooperates with the Veterans' Administration and State veterans' programs.

State departments also act as liaison for rural communities where no chapters have been established. In such cases, the State department either assists the rural community in starting a chapter, or arranges for a nearby chapter to handle the additional service and welfare work.

Local

On the local level, the DAV does some of its most effective work, because it is in the home community that the fight for rehabilitation is won or lost.

In local communities the DAV's services range from the paramount function of helping disabled veterans to make a successful transition to useful civilian life, to morale work such as delivering needed comforts to hospitalized veterans, and helping the families of deceased veterans.

DAV chapter employment officers confer with many small employers, who employ the majority of all workers.

The DAV service worker is experienced in selective placement of disabled veterans. He appraises handicapped ex-servicemen of existing job opportunities, and informs employers of the availability of capable disabled veterans.

"The disabled veteran must be assisted to return, not to a life of pensions and invalidism, but to an active and productive career among his working fellow Americans, as a self-reliant, self-supporting, self-respecting American.

"The Disabled American Veterans represents in its name, in its purpose, and in its accomplishments, those veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country. They, more than any others, deserve first call on all we can do.

"The DAV has been of great help to us in this important work. We welcomed its help in the past. We count confidently upon it for the future.

"I know that a free people can never forget the men whose blood was spilled to keep them free." (Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

"The disabled man is not a handicapped worker when he is properly placed. He is steadier, more careful and less inclined to absenteeism; and he generally turns out equal or superior work." (L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor.)

"If responsible citizens do not act to assist the veteran, to answer his questions, provide him with the opportunities he needs, integrate him into community life, make him feel that he is a vital part of the home-town team, then he may feel that he is an outsider. He may become disgruntled and embittered. He will face the danger of being exploited by unscrupulous men." (Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC, Administrator, Retraining and Reemployment Administration, U. S. Department of Labor.)

"Hand-outs, either by the Government or the public, do not bring about the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. The DAV has learned, through 25 years of experience since World War I, that the real answer is service—expert, direct, personalized—which will make the handicapped ex-serviceman self-supporting and self-respecting. The best way to help disabled veterans to help themselves is to contribute generously to the National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans. Na-

tional headquarters is located at 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y." (Lloyd F. Oleson, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans.)

"I am certain that the American public will support heartily the National Service Fund which is now being raised to expand and maintain the Disabled American Veterans' free rehabilitation services." (Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff of the Army.)

1947 NEEDS

To carry on the national service program of the Disabled American Veterans in 1947, the following budget of minimum requirements must be raised. As more fully explained in previous pages, the DAV is placing principal emphasis on helping disabled veterans to get jobs and to resume normal, productive, civilian lives.

Training course:

Training and maintaining 118 disabled veterans now studying at the American University, Washington, D. C.	\$75,000
On-the-job training and maintenance of 167 disabled veterans who have been graduated from the American University and have been assigned to regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country	275,000
National service program:	
Maintenance of national service headquarters in Washington, D. C., including claims, medical, insurance, civil-service, and employment departments; coordination of field work with Veterans' Administration central office and other Government agencies; research and statistical work	250,000
Maintenance of 95 full-time national service workers throughout the country, including salaries of secretarial and clerical assistance, travel, and other incidental costs in connection with operating service offices	350,000
Employment:	
Cost of maintaining and expanding employment program on the national level, including contact officers to cooperate with Government and private agencies, employers, and veterans	125,000
Public-education program, intensive national program to educate the general public as to the needs and abilities of disabled veterans and to show disabled veterans how they can help themselves	175,000
Total cost, national service program	1,250,000

In addition to the national budget, funds must be raised in each of the States for the activities of the State departments and local chapters, in order to carry out the coordinated service program on the national, state and local levels.

The National Service Fund of the Disabled American Veterans is sponsored by leaders in every walk of life. It is endorsed by the President, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and officials of the armed forces.

The Governors are serving as honorary chairmen for their respective States.

The fund is administered by the board of trustees of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. On the board are men of outstanding administrative ability and wide experience in veterans' affairs. All have a keen sense of patriotism and social responsibility. Trustees are elected from vari-

ous parts of the country to give the board national representation. The board includes: William E. Tate, chairman, Washington, D. C.; John D. Ames, Illinois; John J. Bradley, brigadier general, United States Army, retired, New York; Lewis L. Clarke, New York; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; Miles H. Draper, Florida; James L. Monahan, Minnesota; Lloyd F. Oleson, California; Irving J. Phillipson, major general, United States Army, retired, New Jersey; Arthur W. Procter, New York; Millard W. Rice, Washington, D. C.; Dow V. Walker, Oregon.

"Leaders in every community in the country should participate in this campaign. Every American should do his part in this movement to help all of America's disabled veterans to help themselves." (Charles Shipman Payson, chairman.)

The following are a few of the more than 16,000 individuals and corporations whose financial support is making it possible for the DAV to meet its increased responsibilities: American Airlines, Inc.; American Car & Foundry Co.; American Locomotive Co.; American Maize-Products Co.; American Surety Corp.; American Sugar Refining Co.; American Rolling Mill Co.; American Thread Co.; American Tobacco Co.; Anaconda Copper Mining Co.; Armour & Co.; Atlas Corp.; Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Bache & Co.; Baker & Co.; Balaban & Katz Corp.; Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.; Bayer Co. Division of Sterling Drug, Inc.; Belmont Park War Relief; Blyth & Co.; Breed, Abbott & Morgan; Carson Pirie Scott & Co.; Cartier, Inc.; Celanese Corp. of America; Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.; Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.; Climax Molybdenum Co.; Commonwealth Edison Co., Chicago; Commonwealth & Southern Corp.; Conde Nast Publications, Inc.; Continental Baking Co.; Continental Bank & Trust Co. of New York; Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.; Coverdale & Colpitts; Crane Co.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Cuneo Press; Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.; Thomas A. Edison, Inc.; Eversharp, Inc.; Marshall Field & Co.; First National Bank of Chicago; General Aniline & Film Corp.; General Bronze Corp.; General Electric Co.; Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; Greyhound Corp.; Gulf Oil Corp.; Harris Trust & Savings Bank; Henry Heide, Inc.; Hudnut Sales Co., Inc.; E. F. Hutton & Co.; Inland Steel Foundation, Inc.; International Business Machines Corp.; International Harvester Co.; International Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Kidder, Peabody & Co.; Lambert Pharmacal Co.; Lamborn & Co., Inc.; Lamont, Corliss & Co.; Lever Bros. Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.; London & Lancashire Insurance Co.; Lumberman's Mutual Casualty Co.; Mandel Bros., Inc.; Magnus, Mabey & Reynard, Inc.; Laurence M. Marks & Co.; Marsh & McLennan, Inc.; Metallic Lathers Union; Montgomery Ward & Co.; Northern Trust Co.; Pabst Brewing Co.; Paramount Pictures, Inc.; People's Gas Light & Coke Co.; Prentice-Hall, Inc.; Pressed Steel Car Co.; Procter & Gamble Co.; Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois; Pullman, Inc.; Quaker Oats Co.; Reader's Digest Association, Inc.; Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc.; Remington Rand, Inc.; Rustless Iron & Steel Co.; J. Henry Schroder Banking Corp.; Sears-Roebuck Foundation; Sharon Steel Corp.; L. C. Smith & Corona Typewriter, Inc.; St. Regis Paper Co.; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; Sperry Corp.; E. R. Squibb & Sons; Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Standard Railway Equipment Manufacturing Co.; J. P. Stevens & Co.; Swift & Co.; Symington-Gould Corp.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.; Tide Water Associated Oil Co.; Time, Inc.; Unexcelled Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Union Bag & Paper Co.; Union Carbide & Carbon Co.; United Air Lines; United Cigar-Whelan Stores Corp.; United States Gypsum Co.; United States Potash Co.; United States Trucking Corp.; Vanadium Corp. of America; William R. Warner & Co.; Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Wilson & Co.; F. W. Woolworth Co.; Worthington

Pump & Machinery Corp.; William Wrigley, Jr., Co.

NATIONAL SERVICE FUND OF THE
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
National Campaign Headquarters,
41 East Forty-second Street, New
York, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, each day the papers are filled with propaganda, in both advertising and editorial form, with reference to the labor legislation which has just passed the House and the Senate. Members of Congress are also receiving multitudinous letters in an attempt to influence them while the conference is in progress. However, all of the propaganda of those articles, editorials, and letters fail to show a real knowledge of what Congress did, what the facts of the hearings were, and what the debates disclosed.

I was therefore very much pleased to read an editorial in the Chicago Daily News, written by John S. Knight, the other day, which gives an understanding statement of the measures in question. For this reason I hope you will take time to read it, and I am therefore including the editorial as a part of my remarks.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

CONGRESS' FAIR LABOR BILL REPRESENTS NATION'S WISH

Ever since the United States Senate voted 68 to 24 to restrict labor abuses, Big Labor has let out an anguished cry that the bill is un-American, destroys our freedom, and is definitely a trend toward fascism.

What the union leaders really fear is that, if the Senate bill becomes the law of the country, an equitable and just method of dealing with labor relations will replace the autocratic powers enjoyed by the unions since the early days of the New Deal.

There is nothing in the bill that deprives any American citizen of his constitutional rights or liberties. The bill does endeavor to correct the inequities and injustices of the Wagner act. It is not a punitive measure because under its provisions, no one is to be punished.

REFLECTS VOTE OF LAST FALL

The thumping 68-to-24 majority which the bill received came as an unpleasant surprise to big labor, but it accurately represented the will of the people who voted last November to curb labor's power.

Under the protective provisions of the Wagner Act, big labor's arrogance dissipated much of the good will which could have been retained by even an occasional manifestation of statesmanship.

The people were fed up with ill-timed strikes, jurisdictional disputes, irresponsible leadership and labor's take-it-or-else attitude.

The 1946 elections gave them an opportunity to register a protest and they did it effectively.

In the past they have administered similar rebukes to big business when they thought

business and industrial leaders were outrageously defaulting their public responsibilities.

LABOR COACHES CRY "POLITICS"

Some of labor's apologists, including Edwin A. Lahey, of our Washington staff, charge that "Republican leaders in Congress are more interested in putting President Truman on a spot for 1948 than they are in prescribing for specific problems in our industrial society."

Most Americans are more likely to agree with Walter Lippmann's studied conclusion that "even with its defects, the Senate bill is a statesmanlike effort to carry out the popular will—that laws be enacted which will regulate the power of union labor."

The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The Senate and House labor bills have been passed after months of public hearings and debate.

They represent thoughtful, independent legislative action in keeping with the people's will and in sharp contrast to the spineless servitude of the American Congress under Roosevelt.

If it is Mr. Lahey's idea that Congress should pass only those laws which are acceptable to the President, he is saying, in effect, that we need no Congress at all.

If it is labor's idea that Congress is not following the wishes of the people, its leaders are suffering from a self-imposed and wishful myopia.

If it is anyone's idea that the welfare of the Nation is being jeopardized whenever Congress and the President disagree, they have too little faith in democracy.

EFFORT NOW IS FOR VETO

Big labor is now concentrating its efforts upon obtaining a Presidential veto of the final bill that will emerge from the House-Senate conference.

One of the devices being used is an attempt to persuade the President that the bill was passed with undue haste. "Actually," says the New York Times, "few bills have ever received the thorough consideration, the careful preparation, and the searching debate which this measure has received."

Hearings on it were begun by a Senate committee on January 23, almost as soon as the new Congress convened. On February 5 the House instituted its own independent hearings. Thereafter, over a period of many weeks, both committees took testimony from witnesses representing many points of view and many interests: Government officials, university professors, businessmen, and trade-unionists themselves.

"The actual drafting of the two bills was a studiously slow and careful process, marked by frequent committee votes on contentious points. When the House bill reached the floor it received a full-dress debate. The Senate bill has been the chief business of that branch of Congress ever since debate on it was begun on April 23."

In the light of that record it should be remembered that the Wagner Act, labor's so-called Magna Carta, was introduced by Senator WAGNER on May 15, 1935, and passed after 1 day's debate.

By comparison, labor's charge that the present bills were passed in haste and without adequate consideration is not supported in fact.

PHONY EVILS AID CAMPAIGN

Big labor is also endeavoring to mislead the public by conjuring up all sorts of horrible consequences should the Taft-Hartley bill become law.

On a national ABC network show, the American Federation of Labor presented a

skit in which that traditional ogre, the boss, chortles with a cat-and-canary grin:

"Soon as they pass them bills you boys're gonna be running around these machines like jack rabbits. You're gonna sweat again."

Then Superman of the AFL radio show interjects:

"If these bills are passed, wages will be slashed, purchasing power will diminish sharply, the chief market of the farmer and of industry will be destroyed, production will be cut for lack of buying, millions will lose their jobs. . . . Your voice, the voice of the American people, is the only thing that can kill these slave-labor bills."

In other words, according to these mental juveniles, everyone but labor is preparing to commit economic suicide.

REJECTED GOAL OF EMPLOYERS

To unionists who object that the Taft-Hartley bills will ruin labor, we quote Senator BALL, of Minnesota:

"A lot of employers would like to see us regulate very extensively the internal affairs of the unions. I thought that the idea behind the Republican platform was to get the Government out of interfering with the daily lives of people and organizations. It seems to me that if we take away the monopolistic special privileges of the unions . . . they can run their internal affairs any way they like, and I don't think it is any part of the Government's business."

That statement sounds like good American doctrine to us. No meddling with internal union affairs nor any mollycoddling of business.

WILL THERE BE ONE BIG VETO?

There is much speculation that the President signed the portal-to-portal bill in order to pave the way for a veto of the labor bill.

This thinking is based upon the premise that, while Big Labor expressed public disapproval of the portal-to-portal bill, union leaders will be content to settle for the one big veto they have in mind—any labor legislation that comes out of the House-Senate conference.

Since President Truman has publicly declared several times that corrective labor legislation is sorely needed, there is a distinct possibility that he may sign the bill while disapproving some of its provisions.

Should he veto the measure, the country will be put on notice that the only way to obtain remedial labor legislation is by electing a Republican President in 1948.

We are certain that thought has occurred to Mr. Truman as well.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a statement in the Communist Daily Worker this morning, signed by William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party, and Eugene Dennis, the secretary of the party, who is now being prosecuted for contempt of Congress, demanding that the President veto whatever labor legislation is passed by this Congress.

Mr. OWENS. That is the criticism of most of these articles; the authors show no understanding of the facts.

THE HAZARDS OF BUSINESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, during the war thousands and thousands of contracts with the Government were on a cost-plus basis. The more the contractors spent the more they made. It reminds me of the old ditty:

Pokey, pokey, buy and take;
The more you spend the more we make.

I notice from the Wall Street Journal of April 30 that the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. reports a consolidated net loss of \$19,284,680 for 1946.

This Kaiser-Frazer outfit is one that had many, many contracts under and for the New Deal, spending the people's money. Now that they are spending their money, they find it is not so easy to make a profit, that they have got to watch their pennies. They find also that it is not easy to manage a private business and make a profit. It is time more people realized the Government cannot continue under cost-plus contracts or the Government will keep losing.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

KAISER-FRAZER REPORTS CONSOLIDATED NET LOSS OF \$19,284,680 IN 1946—PRODUCTION UPSWING IN APRIL, COMPANY SAYS, WILL PUT FIRM ON PROFITABLE OPERATING BASIS

WILLOW RUN, MICH.—Kaiser-Frazer Corp. reported a consolidated net loss for 1946 of \$19,284,680 in its first annual report mailed to stockholders.

At the same time the company revealed a production upswing for April. This, Edgar F. Kaiser, vice president and general manager said, will put the auto firm on a profitable operating basis.

Mr. Kaiser disclosed that more than 400 cars per day were turned out during the latter part of April, and that the corporation had scheduled the production of 10,000 automobiles in May and 12,000 in June.

He said these schedules would be increased if Continental Motors Corp. meets its engine commitments.

With this greatly increased production forecast, Kaiser-Frazer should show substantial earnings in the second quarter, Mr. Kaiser added.

The statement shows that the loss for the year 1946 includes all the expenses for engineering, design, and preparation for production of automobiles, no part of which was deferred.

The report which was signed by Henry J. Kaiser, chairman, and Joseph W. Frazer, president of the company, said that despite material shortages, the company has shown steady progress in automobile production since the first seven cars rolled from the assembly lines last June. In September, 1,120 cars were built, November 4,089, January 7,141, and approximately 8,000 in April. More than 37,500 Kaiser and Frazer automobiles have been turned out at the Willow Run plant to date. Approximately 2,600 of these cars are in transit or are in the hands of dealers, 1,100 are being used by the dealers as demonstrators, while the rest of 33,800 were sold to the public.

Kaiser-Frazer Corp. and subsidiaries report for year ended December 31, 1946, net sales of \$11,504,443 and miscellaneous income of \$153,529, making total income of \$11,657,972. Costs, expenses, and other deductions totaled \$31,037,375 and minority interest was \$94,722, leaving a net loss for the year of \$19,284,681.

Consolidated balance sheet as of December 31, 1946, shows total assets of \$46,287,879. Cash was \$7,226,096; inventories \$13,486,072; current assets \$25,696,353, and current liabilities \$13,879,007. Capital surplus was \$50,466,274 and deficit from operations amounted to \$20,057,402. There were 4,000,000 common shares outstanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] before a gathering at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex., on May 17, 1947, which was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain excerpts.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address he delivered over radio station WJR in Detroit on last Saturday evening.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a radio speech he made recently.

THE FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the United Press recently carried a story under a Phoenix, Ariz., dateline, quoting Robert J. Kleberg, president of the King Ranch, and brother of our former Texas colleague, as making some rather serious charges concerning the campaign to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

Believing that these charges should not go unchallenged, I asked Dr. Bennett T. Simms, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, to comment on them.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include at this point a copy of the United Press article together with a letter from Dr. Simms replying to the charges contained therein:

CATTLE DISEASE FUNDS MISUSED, KLEBERG SAYS

PHOENIX, Ariz., May 9.—American funds intended to eradicate the hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico are being used in such a way as "to permanently fasten the disease on Mexico and assure its spread to the United States," Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., president of the world's largest ranch, charged in letters received here Friday.

The head of the King Ranch made the allegation in a three-page signed "analysis" of the program financed by the United States to slaughter all cattle in the infected zone below the border.

HE MAKES CHARGES

Kleberg said the effectiveness of the program depended on disposal of slaughtered animals by burial in quicklime on the premises. He charged that the cattle were being taken to slaughterhouses and the meat distributed for human consumption, which "means a permanent source of reinfection is maintained."

The rancher added that it was difficult to believe "that it was planned that way, but an analysis . . . certainly leads to that conclusion."

"It would be normal for animals 'in herds not yet affected' to be moved to slaughterhouses provided they have not been exposed to infection," wrote Kleberg. "But it is abnormal that the United States pay for these cattle and let the Mexican Government pocket the proceeds from their sale."

The Texan pointed out that Congress appropriated \$9,000,000 to pay for the program, earmarking \$7,500,000 to pay for cattle slaughtered.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1947.

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE, House of Representatives.

DEAR DR. GILLIE: Reference is made to our telephone conversation yesterday regarding some comments made by Mr. R. J. Kleberg concerning the foot-and-mouth disease eradication campaign in Mexico.

We do not believe that Mr. Kleberg has been fully informed regarding this campaign. The basic policy agreed upon as offering the greatest promise of ultimate success in Mexico was formulated at the meeting of the Animal Industry Sub-Commission of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission. Resolution III adopted at that meeting gives the reasoning underlying this policy decision as given in the attached Supplement No. 1 to Summary of Developments in the Mexican outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. The campaign involves a combination of the drastic slaughter method in the outlying infected zones with a program of orderly marketing within the main infected zone of livestock from herds where the disease has not appeared and herds which have been infected but have since entirely recovered and are apparently healthy at the time of marketing.

Mr. Kleberg is critical of the administrative action taken under the laws authorizing the Department to participate in the Mexican campaign. We feel that the actions of the Bureau and others in the Department have been fully in accord with the program outlined to the Congress when appearances were made before the committees to explain the need for legislation and give the estimates of the initial expenditures. In addition to the printed record of the hearings before these committees we quote here for ready reference the printed statement of justification which accompanied the Department's request for funds:

"Foot-and-mouth disease has become so widespread in Mexico that the facilities of that country alone are insufficient to cope successfully with the problem. Under the cooperative campaign proposed pursuant to Public Law 8, approved February 28, 1947, an extremely rigid quarantine will be established and maintained around the area where the disease presently exists. Susceptible animals and dangerous products will be prevented from moving out of the quarantined area, and no animals will be allowed to move into the area except for immediate slaughter. All susceptible animals in newly infected and directly exposed herds or flocks will be disposed of by immediate destruction on the premises, followed by thorough disinfection."

"Contribution of the United States: It is planned that approximately 150,000 cattle will be slaughtered before June 30, 1947. These animals will be purchased by the joint board, their price being computed on a weight basis. The average cost will be about \$50 per head. The purchase price for these cattle is estimated at \$7,500,000, which expense will be assumed by the United States

through the joint board. To facilitate the purchase of these cattle, funds will be transferred to the joint board to make these purchases. Cattle not destroyed will be turned over to the Government of Mexico for slaughter for food purposes. Any moneys received through their sale will be used by the Government of Mexico in furtherance of the campaign, in addition to other services rendered by Mexico. * * *

It is agreed that the disposal of apparently healthy herds within the infected zone by shipment to consuming centers for slaughter is a slower process than the one always used in this country. However, the infection already exists in these consuming centers in the infected zone and it is intended that they will be left until the last of the cleanup. The products and byproducts of the slaughtering are to be consumed or destroyed within this area. In the meantime the liquidation by destruction or shipment for slaughter of all susceptible animals in the area, if accomplished, will obviate the setting up of new centers. The purpose, of course, is gradually to pinch out the infection by this means. This will allow time for education of the people, for providing replacements for work stock, consisting in many districts almost entirely of work oxen, and to take other measures to prevent complete demoralization of the economy of the region. Of course, the success or failure of these methods rests to a very considerable extent upon the effectiveness of the quarantine maintained around the main infected zone. This matter is receiving the close attention of the United States section of the Joint Commission in Mexico and there is evidence that the quarantine methods are being constantly improved.

As all products derived from animals slaughtered are to be consumed or destroyed within the area the movement of any such out of the area and the use of them in provisioning ships or planes or other carriers are precluded.

Along with the organized effort to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in central Mexico, measures have been and are being taken to guard our borders against the possibility of the appearance of the disease in the northern States of that country. It is recognized that a land boundary is not nearly as effective a barrier against introduction of the infection as are oceans or seas. Hence, if the disease penetrates into northern Mexico it must be expected that there will be occasional outbreaks in this country notwithstanding our best efforts along the border. However, as all interests concerned are aware of that danger and therefore will exercise the utmost watchfulness, any center of infection appearing here should be quickly discovered. With that advantage and with energetic action following there is every reason to believe that we shall be able to arrest and eradicate any outbreak that may occur in this country with all possible speed.

Very truly yours,

B. T. SIMMS,
Chief of Bureau.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe what we read in the papers we can come to but one conclusion, that the warehouses of this country are bulging with sugar just as the granaries of the ancient Pharaohs

were bursting with stored wheat, corn, and barley.

This food should be made available to our housewives so that the American diet may be improved. Cakes, preserved fruits, pies, bread, and all the other edibles that have been common to the American table for a century before the recent war ought to be prepared once again in home ovens. People are unable to maintain our usually high standard of living unless more sugar is distributed per capita. You will remember how Joseph in the Bible opened the granaries of ancient Egypt when the people hungered. It is time a modern Joseph came forward and opened the warehouses of sugar so that the American family may have an adequate supply for which we have all hungered for so long.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a newspaper article by Constantine Brown, an editorial from the New York Post, and a letter addressed to Members of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dean Alfange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Sunday Post.

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Mr. Dubinsky appearing in the New York Times magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Congress is about to enter the final stages of its antilabor program, which was inaugurated with the Eightieth Congress, it would be well to stop, look, and listen. I have long been a friend of labor, and while with many other of its friends, I recognize that some remedial legislation is needed, I feel certain that the bitterness engendered by the definitely hostile legislation this House has already passed and the legislation which is likely to result from the conference with the other legislative body on the hill, will only drive labor, in its efforts to retain its hard-won gains, to the left.

We know that communism has already infiltrated into many of our labor unions. We also know that the real leaders of American labor realize the dangers of this infiltration and are endeavoring to stem it. Oppressive legislation will only

make the task of these true labor leaders more difficult and will give strength to the communistic effort to bend labor to the Moscow line.

The fight against communistic infiltration is well told by that distinguished labor leader, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, in an article entitled "A Warning Against Communists in Unions," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on May 11 last. I commend this article to my colleagues for their thoughtful reading.

The article, which I include herein by unanimous consent, is as follows:

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS MR. DUBINSKY SAYS THEIR AIMS AND SPIRITS ARE HOSTILE TO THE POLICIES OF TRADE-UNIONISM

What Communists do in the trade-unions of any country vitally affects the welfare and security of its entire people, and not merely its organized labor movement.

No organization in American life has been immune from Communist penetration. Obedient to centralized direction, Communists have bored within church bodies, educational institutions, women's clubs, scientific groups, and, believe it or not, businessmen's associations.

But the labor unions have been their special target. Without control of the trade-unions the Communists would be lost. The unions form their economic base. Without direction of the key workers' groups, their other "transmission belts" would be useless. The workers' organizations are the largest and most vital nongovernmental body in the community. They are primarily dedicated to improving working conditions, to raising living standards. They are part of a delicate mechanism of modern life, the core of human engineering. The influence of organized labor reaches far beyond its 13,000,000 members or their families.

For this reason the significance of Communist operations in trade-unions can scarcely be exaggerated. Like termites, they bore into the house of labor, but are not an integral part of the structure because the spirit and aims of totalitarian communism are totally distinct from and hostile to the ideals and policies of free trade-unionism.

Free trade unionism may have its faults, but they can be remedied because essentially the processes of these unions are democratic, even though, at times, they may fall short of the ideal.

But communism, in unions and other organizations, is conspiratorial. It is based on the elimination of majority rule. It aims to establish the one-party state as the sole power over all groups. The unions, they are convinced, are the stepping stones to this goal.

The Communist technique is simple. The party agent forms the acquaintance of a member of a union which is marked for capture. They form a "cell" or "fraction" of a few like-minded members. With the help of the party agent a program is prepared. Naturally, it follows the Communist Party line.

At the outset, the party representative's choice falls on a unionist who knows something about parliamentary procedure. Then the stage is set. The innocent is introduced to an important party functionary or well-known party speaker; he is taken to cocktail parties and dances and no time is lost in introducing him to attractive partners.

The next scene is at the union meeting. Hardly is the gathering called to order before the Communist "fraction" starts to work. A member or, better still, a stooge or

"innocent" makes a motion. The debate is on. It may and frequently does last long into the night. Slowly the members who want some sleep slip out of the room. As they do, the Communist tide rises. A vote may be taken at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. The party-liners win.

Sounds simple, does it not? It is simple. And yet that is the way the followers of Stalin have captured trade unions. The same procedure used at national conventions results in the Communist capture or control of the larger units.

The Communists cannot act single-handed. They must have help. They must be part of a crowd, of a "united front" or a "popular front," whatever the name may be. Because they know what they want, because they are skilled in parliamentary tactics, and use any methods or weapons and because they reject no trick or device, they make headway.

But the Communist "fraction" does not always plant its own member in the union president's office. This place is often reserved for the ambitious opportunist who is ready to "play along." The "fraction" may even seek out a pliable promising non-Communist Party man to bear the title of president and thus serve as a good cover for the actual party control of the union. If he stands for the party program, that is enough. Of course the real job, such as secretary-treasurer and organizational director, must go to strict party men.

The whole Communist apparatus is highly centralized—"democratic centralism" is the phrase. But forget the "democratic." That's camouflage. The machinery is geared for quick action, for when the party line is "handed down" it must be obeyed with blind military discipline. There is no time for debate, only for "discussion and approval."

The Communists refer to themselves as the "vanguard" of labor. Nothing could be further from the truth. They have disrupted many unions with their factional quarrels and have left in their wake many saddened and disillusioned members, destroyed businesses and blasted hopes. Far from being "progressive," as they claim, they are really "dynamic reactionaries," as someone has called them.

To them ethics and morality are "bourgeois" virtues. Therefore, in the unions, as elsewhere, they will support a conservative or reactionary if he should oblige them by favoring a pro-Soviet or property line.

Many cases are at hand to prove this assertion. Indeed, we can show examples of union leaders who have dipped into their organizations' treasures and grossly mismanaged union affairs without any condemnation by the Communists. In such cases the Communists have jumped hard on anyone who has tried to unseat the financially delinquent and incompetent non-Communist "friend of the Soviet Union."

As self-constituted champions of the Negro race the Communists have never faltered in praise of their alleged attitude on race discrimination. Yet they have never criticized the head of one of the Nation's important unions who is known to be largely responsible for drawing the color line in his own organization.

Why? This union official, though not a Communist, has, out of vanity, or ignorance perhaps, permitted his name to be used as a sponsor of Soviet "front" outfits.

In another important union the national president has winked at Communist domination of local activities in two important metropolitan areas. By this concession he has bought off criticism of his administration of union affairs. This officer even sits at labor conventions with men he knows are Communist leaders of his affiliates.

It is evident that vanity and lack of principle by non-Communist unionists have a bearing on the reasons why pro-Communist elements make headway in the mass work-

ers units. Opportunism is a quality that is found everywhere.

Even in our own international union any local officer, no matter how conservative or incompetent, can avoid criticism by Communists and even obtain their support by merely endorsing some resolution favoring Russian foreign policy or the party line.

To Communists the yardstick of a union leader's "progressivism" is not the soundness of his labor policies but his readiness to approve Kremlin policy. That is why I consider them totalitarian reactionaries.

The fact is that real progressive unionists are the foremost targets of these leftists while conservative unionists are quite safe from their onslaughts. The reason is simple. The liberal unionist knows the score. He is wise to Communist machinations. He can find his way through the jungle of double talk raised by the "saviors of the working class." This will explain why the ILGWU has been the butt of bitter Communist assaults for so many years.

Although our union is free of the Communist menace today, it was not always so. In 1926 the Communist Party through its demagogic propaganda and exaggerated promises was able to attract many of our members. It thus managed to obtain control of our New York organization and succeeded in plunging the coat and suit industry into a general strike. After a futile 8-week struggle the local Communist leaders had had enough. They were ready to come to a settlement, but the Communist Party, feeling that the Moscow line was about to change, ordered their agents inside the union to continue the strike—against their better judgment and against the interests of the workers.

The strike ended disastrously after 18 more weeks of futile agony on the picket lines in order to justify the Communist class struggle dogma. This terrible fiasco, however, unseated the Communists in our union. Since then, most of the leaders of that strike have broken with Communist totalitarianism and have returned to the union. These same leaders are now the most effective fighters against Communist influence and domination.

It took 10 years for us to recover from the criminal and stupid Communist-led strike of 1926, which cost \$3,500,000 and left in its wake a chaotic industry and a crippled union.

Other unions are going through the same experience we have had. Now and then the curtain is pulled aside and we see what is happening. Take the case of Joseph Curran, of the CIO's National Maritime Union. He knows the story from the inside. He says that 500 Communist Party members dominate his union of 80,000 members through tactics "no different than those practiced by the Nazis when they destroyed the trade-union movement of Germany."

By means of its cells the Communist Party, according to Mr. Curran, was able to take 107 out of 150 elective offices in this union, one of the most strategic in the Nation's life. These 107 officials, says Mr. Curran, are "more interested in assuring that the National Maritime Union becomes a stooge union of the Communist Party than they are in keeping it an instrument belonging to the rank-and-file seamen who built it."

Interference by the Communist Party in union elections, finances, and strike policies was but recently exposed by J. A. (Pat) Sullivan, president of the Canadian Seamen's Union, an affiliate of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress.

For years prior to his frank confession of Communist affiliation Mr. Sullivan repeatedly denied that tie. He did so, he says, in order to win two elective positions—secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress and head of the Canadian

seamen's organization, strategic posts from which he could serve the Communist Party.

The Communists are desperately working day and night to get control of progressive unions. With these as a base they can then launch their attacks on more conservative union citadels. Once in control of a few key progressive unions they have a toehold in the inner circles and policy-making body of the whole labor movement. This is no small achievement. It means representation on committees and bodies of all sorts, visiting the President, for example, having an entree to important Government departments, and gaining access to what might otherwise be secret information, and, naturally, passing it on to the party commissars.

One Communist-dominated union suddenly conceived the idea of organizing workers in the Panama Canal Zone. Overnight the organizer flew to that strategic area. In a comparatively short time the union boasted 13,000 members there. Was this display of activity solely an interest in trade-unionism?

I will not deny that Communists, at times, fight to improve the lot of the wage earners but only when such a policy coincided with the interests of the Soviet rulers. If it is to their advantage to forego demands on their employers, to neglect grievances, to engage in the maximum of class collaboration, they will do so.

Take their attitude toward President Roosevelt. When the New Deal was sponsoring important social legislation, Earl Browder saw in it "the clearest example of the tendencies toward fascism." Roosevelt's labor policies, according to Mr. Browder, constituted "the American brother to Mussolini's corporate state with state-controlled labor unions closely tied up and under the direction of the employers."

Subsequently, when the party line changed, no praise of Roosevelt was too great for Mr. Browder. However, during the Hitler-Stalin pact this ersatz Fuehrer thundered in Madison Square Garden, "The Rooseveltism of the New Deal has capitulated to reactionaries."

Yet the moment Russia was forced into the war by Hitler everything changed again. The Communists buried their class struggle theory temporarily and they stopped strikes abruptly because they were no longer interested in embarrassing our defense preparations or sabotaging aid to Britain. In fact, they glorified F. D. R. in terms second only to those held in reserve for Stalin. In this and in their temporarily servile submission to American employers they had but one motive: to serve Russian interests, not those of the American people.

The unions under Communist domination reflected this sudden change faithfully because they are completely wired for Communist sound. Read their organs and you will learn that as soon as Russia entered the war they abandoned their campaign against lend-lease and frowned on any interruption of production. In this period, one of the largest of these Communist-dominated unions even espoused an elaborate incentive production plan of the type denounced by labor for many years as speed-up. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the reason.

For purely Communist purposes, the needs of Russian foreign policy, the Communists have brought discredit to the time-honored weapon of trade-union picketing. They threw a picket line around a hotel to interfere with a dinner officially tendered to Winston Churchill by the city of New York. In another instance Philip Murray had to intervene to prevent the Communist-dominated New York City CIO-Industrial Council from proclaiming a 2-hour city-wide political strike. The strike was called ostensibly to support another CIO union—also in the Communist orbit.

Harry Bridges, who runs the west coast longshoremen's unions, is familiar with all

the curves in the Communist Party line. When American cooperation with the Soviet Union was the order of the day during the war he boldly proclaimed the idea of extending the no-strike pledge beyond the war period. But he dropped this line when the war ended and the party line changed. Behind this changed expression is his belief, shared by other Communist Party line followers, that the political strike is more important than the economic strike. Keep that in mind. It is important. The reason is obvious. The political strike is a revolutionary weapon. The economic strike is not.

What would happen if the Communists should gain control of the American trade-union movement?

Let Tomsky, prominent Russian trade-union leader, a suicide in one of the party purges, give the answer:

"If for a moment we could imagine that tomorrow all the trade-unions of Germany would march hand in hand with the German Communist Party, we would have no doubt that a Soviet government would be established there within 5 minutes after that combination of forces took place. . . . If we could imagine for a moment a combination of the trade-unions with the Communist Party of England, then a Soviet government would rapidly spring up also in England."

Obviously, the extent to which Communists succeed in capturing posts and securing domination over unions vitally concerns the entire Nation and not merely the particular labor body affected.

Present-day France affords a striking and tragic confirmation of this truth. The Communists in France now dominate the General Confederation of Labor. No doubt the Communist party in France owes much of its electoral strength to the stranglehold it has over the great trade unions in the metal trades, coal fields, transportation and other key labor organizations. Through its airtight control of the trade-unions, the Communist Party has, whenever it so desired, exercised veto power over the French Government's economic policies. Because of this Communist control of the General Confederation of Labor, the numerically largest political party in France is one whose policies are controlled by a foreign power and not by its membership.

We must never forget that the Communists took to resistance in France not when their own country was attacked but only after Russia was invaded. What a menace this development is to the stability and security of France is clear to all.

In many important respects, the situation now prevailing in Italy is similar.

Were the Communists ever to exercise such domination over the American trade-union movement and thereby secure such a decisive political position, our own country would find itself just as unstable and insecure—its national independence vitally sapped—at the mercy and whim of a ruthless, foreign, totalitarian dictatorship.

Liberals render a distinct disservice to the Nation when they allow themselves to be used as fig leaves, front men or transmission belts by the Communists. Some liberals deliberately allow themselves to be thus used; others may do so unwittingly. But in both cases such liberals lend most vital prestige indispensable to Communist success.

Non-Communist trade-union leaders who join with the Communists in united front movements render an equally distinct disservice to the people as a whole and to organized labor in particular.

The present trend in the country against communism has so far resulted only in an increasing number of union members getting on to the Communist game. Some leaders of trade unions have left their posts in disgust because of their belated realization as to what the Communists have been doing right under their noses. But though more

and more rank-and-file workers in Communist-dominated unions are waking up to the fact that they have been used as dupes by the Communist Party, the Communists have not yet been dislodged from the control of any unions which they have been holding in their grip. In recent months the Communist Party has been put on the defensive and has lost some ground. But it continues to maintain its stranglehold on a number of unions.

How much strength do the Communists have in the unions? It is impossible to give an exact figure of their trade-union membership.

Today the Communist Party claims 70,000 members. Let us assume that 35,000 of these are in the unions. That would give the party a maximum numerical strength of 0.0027 percent of the 13,000,000 trade-union members. But despite their insignificant numbers, the Communists and their fellow-travelers and party-liners dominate 12 to 15 out of 40 national CIO unions. They have a strong bloc on the CIO executive board.

None of the 110 national unions of the AFL is dominated by Communists, but they do control locals of an undetermined number, though not many.

It is safe to say that no important labor union in the United States has more than 2 percent Communist membership. Because of their devious methods of operation, however, the Communists and their followers wield an influence far out of proportion to their numbers. It is truly a case of the Communist tail in some cases wagging the trade-union dog.

The real danger from the Communists in trade-unions is that they control strategically placed workers in key industries such as communications, transportation, shipping and maritime and electrical manufacturing.

Here and there influential labor leaders have felt they could use the Communists to their advantage. Uniformly, this policy has been a failure, sometimes a disaster. The history of the CIO is abundant proof of my statement. Free, democratic trade-unionism and communism do not mix. One cancels out the other. To be free, the unions must keep the Communists out of leadership which they would use to advance their party interests.

How can this be done? We start from the assumption, which is a fact, that up to now the totalitarian success in trade-unions has been scored largely by default. The Communists have broken through open doors.

Today the constructive trade union leader who is fighting the infiltration of Communists into his organization is faced with other grave obstacles. Curiously enough, these hindrances come from those antunion legislators, on the national and State levels, who presumably are opposed to communism but who at the same time are doing all they can to break down the trade unions and thereby help to strengthen the Communist position.

Every antunion law passed by Congress becomes a trump card in the hands of the Communists. Weaken the trade-unions and you open wide the dikes for Communist propaganda to rush through. Nearsighted "regulators" of trade-unionism in our legislative halls are the best pals the Communists could wish for in this country.

It is sheer nonsense for anyone to believe the Communists have a monopoly of organizational skill. They can be beaten by the conscious combined will of the progressive and democratic forces within the unions. Over and over again our experience in the ILGWU has supported this contention.

A local of the ILGWU with a membership of 25,000 held an election recently. It has less than 500 avowed or known Communists. Yet, because of their energy, discipline, unscrupulousness in creating false issues and propagandistic activity, they polled 5,000

votes. Suppose only 9,000 members had gone to the polls. Less than 500 Communists would have taken control of a local with such a huge membership. Only because the progressive forces were alert, were well led and were able to bring 80 percent of the members out to vote did they succeed in defeating the Communist-led forces 3 to 1.

Therefore, to meet the situation, trade-union progressives must:

1. Put at least as much energy in organizing the majority as the Communists do in organizing the minority.

2. Enlightened trade-unionists do not have to ban Communist propaganda to stop party infiltration. Outlawing the Communist Party from the political arena or Communists from trade-union membership is not an effective way of combating them. We must rely on education and discussions of daily problems confronting labor, on the systematic enlightenment of our members about the grave issues facing us.

3. We must do everything we can to bring home to the rank and file the importance of attending their local meetings and sharing in the responsibilities of union membership. They must lead in handling grievances in the shops and factories. They must serve on committees that administer the policies of the union, no matter how dull this work seems to be—remembering that if progressive unionists fail in these tasks the Communists will undertake them for their party purposes.

4. Local unions should make it obligatory for members to attend meetings and participate in elections in order to insure that all decisions reflect the will of the majority. This would serve as the most effective barrier to Communist minority control of unions.

Local unions must work out practical administrative methods of stimulating all members to take part in every phase of union life, to take time and patience to interest members in such a program. Efforts must continue despite discouragement.

5. As trade union leaders we must be tireless in our efforts to solve the daily problems of the wage-earners in improving their working conditions, living standards and safeguarding their political rights and interests.

6. Constructive unionists must refrain from competing with Communists or others in making extravagant "pie-in-the-sky" promises that cannot be fulfilled.

If we follow these rules we can easily overcome the Communist nuclei in the trade unions in every test of strength. These strepto-Communist cells, like those of other diseases, thrive in darkness and ignorance. They do not multiply in unions where leaders and members are alert, honest, and competent.

What the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has been able to do since it routed the Communists 20 years ago every progressive American labor union can do today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may address themselves to the Navy appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon may have opportunity to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

A WARNING AGAINST COMMUNISTS IN UNIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] who just addressed the House has inserted in the RECORD exactly what I have in my pocket. I intended to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have read that article. It is a most revealing statement by Mr. Dubinsky, a man who knows what he is talking about. Here is the leader of a great labor organization sounding a warning to the American people of the menace and threat that communism has proven itself to be among labor unions. Communism is here to destroy labor unions, because labor unions do not exist under a communistic form of government. They may compete one plant against another for the benefit of the state but beyond that they cannot organize, nor can they strike against the government.

I am delighted that the gentleman from New York has seen fit to put that article in the RECORD, because if he had not, I would have done so myself.

TERMINAL LEAVE BONDS FOR EX-SERVICEMEN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it seems that House bill 3 providing for cash payment of the GI terminal leave bonds is getting nowhere fast. There seems to be some objection to this bill because it might unbalance the budget or disturb the cash position of the Treasury. I have therefore introduced another bill, H. R. 3521, which will not do any one of these things, at the same time the GI's may get their money. This bill would make those bonds negotiable at face value plus interest to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to a purchaser.

Now, no one, department or bureau can object to this procedure. At the present time the veteran holding terminal leave pay bonds is being discriminated against as a bondholder since they cannot be exchanged for money. There is not another single Government bond issued by this Government that the holder of that bond cannot get the cash on, except the terminal leave pay bonds that have been issued to these GI Joes. He was discriminated against in that he was not given terminal leave until H. R. 4051 became law and after he got the terminal leave pay bonds, he is being discriminated against in that he cannot receive cash for these bonds, whereas all other bondholders can get the cash within 60 days to 6 months.

My bill H. R. 3521 repeals that harsh section in H. R. 4051 which provides that "such bonds shall not be negotiable and shall not be transferred by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise," thus making the

holder of the terminal leave pay bonds powerless to use these bonds for 5 years which is like giving a soldier a gun without ammunition, or an old rusty musket whose trigger will not work. My bill provides that the veteran can use these bonds. He can sell them and get the cash and in selling his bonds he will not lose anything. As a matter of fact, he probably will make a little, since the bonds are such good investments that they probably will sell at a premium. There are many banks and other investors anxious to acquire such securities at 2½ percent interest. It will not make any difference financially to the Government, since it has to pay the bonds together with accrued interest at the expiration of 5 years, anyhow. I hope that every Member of this Congress will cooperate in getting this bill passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Business Analyst.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by one of the boys from my district who was one of the six who took the oath at the Elbe 2 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered on Thursday, May 15, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood].

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and also to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean concerning the Supreme Court decision in the Freight Rate case.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two clippings appearing in the Washington Post last Sunday.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters and one telegram from a veterans' organization,

Cambridge, Mass., endorsing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles, one letter, and one resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered at Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Charles Luckman.

PRO-COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there was placed on the desk of each Member of this House yesterday morning a publication known as Survey Graphic, which contained 129 pages of outrageously vile and nauseating anti-Southern, anti-Christian, un-American, and pro-Communist tripe, ostensibly directed toward the elimination of the custom of racial segregation in the South.

The principal articles in this lying, preposterous, pusillanimous, dirt-flinging tirade against the white people of the South are the brain children of a couple of renegade crackpot newspapermen who list themselves as Mississippians, although I never heard of either of them. Most of the other poppycock was written by meddling un-American purveyors of hate and indecency from other parts of the country.

Now, as a southerner, a white man, and an American, I resent these continuous unwarranted and uncalled-for attacks on my people, and I am not going to stand by and see them go unanswered.

These are the same people who today are striving toward doing away with our democratic form of government by the infiltration of their communistic theology into our everyday thinking and living. They would see America destroyed through mongrelization and moral degeneration, as other great nations in history have fallen and been destroyed.

I would suggest that you consign this filthy, slimy instrument of evil to the nearest furnace and then bury the ashes so that its foul smell will not linger in the nostrils of the American people—and heed the words of a real champion of the welfare of the Negro race—Abraham Lincoln—who said the following in a speech in Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858:

I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, not to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that

there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR FUTURE LEADERS OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and also to include an address by Charles Luckman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Luckman, the president of one of the large manufacturing concerns, made a proposal in a speech on May 15 which is worth the serious consideration of all thoughtful Americans. He proposes a broad educational program to make full use of all of our educational facilities. He says that it is about time for us to declare war on ignorance. He takes the position that if we can afford to spend \$20,000,000,000 a year on recreation, alcohol, and beauty preparations, we can afford to spend an additional \$3,000,000,000 for knowledge and understanding so vital to our democratic way of life. He proposes, too, that we make a fresh approach to our industrial conflict by providing an educational program for the future leaders of labor and management.

Mr. Luckman offers to provide \$100,000 of the \$1,000,000 needed to set up the management-labor program. It is Mr. Luckman's view that much good can be derived from living together and studying together by leaders of management and labor.

It gives me great pleasure to call your attention to this proposal of a leading industrialist who in the space of a very few years and at a very early age has risen, through his own efforts, to a position of great power and importance in American business, and who is now demonstrating a broad capacity for leadership.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP CURLEY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when death calls a leader of men, one who has been a great and good man, a deep feeling of regret results.

This is particularly so when Providence takes from our midst the spiritual leader of any faith, who by his action, his conduct, and his effort to do good, so favorably impresses others that he becomes an inspiration and an example, and thus leads the way for those who follow to become better men and better women.

The Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, was such a spiritual leader. For over 40 years as a priest, as a bishop, and an archbishop of the Catholic Church, he served his God and his country in a brilliant, courageous, and constructive manner.

He dedicated every moment of his life to the service of God and country. He can truly be called a great priest and a great American.

Archbishop Curley first began his priestly duties in Deland, Fla.; from that day forward and until the day of his death he evidenced by his efforts his love of the poor and the underprivileged.

The archbishop recognized the importance of education to the individual. He recognized its value in making better citizens and, as a result, a better country. He exemplified education productive of fine and noble character.

Despite his long illness, he unstintingly devoted himself to his duties as the spiritual leader of his archdiocese and never for a moment shirked the great responsibilities of his trust.

The people of Baltimore and Washington in particular, and the people of our country in general, will mourn deeply his death, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jew.

Archbishop Curley will be long remembered for his efforts to create better understanding among men. His lifetime work of constructive effort among men of all creeds will mark him well on the pages of history.

A great churchman and a great citizen has taken the journey into the great beyond. However, his spirit and the influence of his work for God and country will live forever.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article by Col. Harris Hull on air power, and in the other a statement by former Secretary of State Byrnes.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three short articles from a Long Beach paper.

MERCURY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that we have large stock piles of mercury in the country, and that the Stock Pile Board, therefore, is not concerned about the present condition of the

mercury-producing mines of the United States. Mercury is a vital defense metal. Regardless of whether or not the stock piles of mercury are now considered adequate, our mines should be kept in a position so that they might be immediately able to turn out this needed metal for any emergency.

Unfortunately, the reluctance of the Stock Pile Board to purchase mercury from domestic sources and the fact that large quantities of cheap metal are coming in from other countries are ruining our mercury-mining industry. An inadequate tariff also contributes to this situation. Not many years ago, some 140 mercury mines were operating in this country. Now a scant half dozen are in a position to produce at all, and these may be shut down at any time. The cost of reopening these mines in time of emergency would be infinitely greater than the cost of reasonable stimulation by the Government.

If we are to have feeling of national security, we must make certain that we will not want for strategic and critical materials in time of war. Adequate stock piles are insurance and will tide us over until closed mines can be reopened, but I call attention to the fact that it is during the time of emergency that we need all of the equipment, power, and men for other purposes which would be consumed by reestablishing closed mercury mines. I believe, therefore, the Government should stimulate the production of mercury and other strategic minerals during peacetime to make certain that we have at least a nucleus of a going industry as a policy of national insurance.

Bills on this subject and to accomplish the purposes herein referred to have been introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER]. I call the attention of the House to these bills and urge that the principles embodied in them be enacted into law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report entitled "American World Intelligence."

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a proposed amendment to the bill, S. 814.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House I know that you are just as sincere and honest and anxious to do the things that will further the interests of this country as I am. I know that so much of your time is employed and that you use most of your waking moments considering important matters. But I do hope and fervently pray that this particular session of the

Congress will not close until we have written into law a bill that will improve our present old-age-pension program.

I think we ought to pay our old-age pensioners who are entitled to receive the money, by check, directly from Washington through the United States mail without a lot of red tape. These good old folks who are entitled to receive this money should get it without having so much of it deducted for administrative costs and I hope and fervently pray that we can do something for them along this line.

WASHINGTON POST STIRS RACE TROUBLE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse what my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said a moment ago about this inspired, concerted drive against the white people of America, and especially of the Southern States.

The one agency that has done the white people of the District of Columbia more harm and has probably done the Negroes more injury than any other is the Jewish-owned Washington Post, which is continuously trying to break down segregation in the District of Columbia and stir up race trouble by forcing Negroes into white theaters, restaurants, hotels, picture shows, and public schools.

If they keep up their drive until they stir a race riot in the District of Columbia, the Post may reap the wrath of an outraged public.

A few days ago our Committee on Un-American Activities went to Hollywood, Calif., and uncovered a conspiracy of treason, if you please, that is shocking to the American people. The Communist cartoonist for the Washington Post comes out yesterday with a cartoon making fun of that investigation, trying to destroy its influence with the Congress of the United States. This morning it carries a full-page Communist advertisement smearing and maligning the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The people of California by the thousands have appealed to us, and the people who are legitimately engaged in the moving-picture industry in Hollywood have appealed to us to clean up Hollywood and put a stop to the dissemination of Communist propaganda through the moving-picture shows.

Yet when we send our committee out there and the ablest men in California, who know more about it than anybody else, come before the committee and give the information that is a shock to the people of America, we find this Communist cartoon and this Communist advertisement in the Washington Post.

As I said, this paper is doing the Negroes more harm than good. It is doing its own people more harm than good and stirring up trouble for the white gentiles

of the District, without doing the people of the rest of the country any good.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION ACT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 2123, an act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert:

"Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the Peoria County Bar Association.

ADDRESS OF MRS. SHURA VOZILOVA LEWIS AT WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1947, a very attractive lady of Russian birth made an address at Western High School in Washington, D. C. This stirred up considerable public interest, not only here but in other sections of the country. I think the matter is of such moment that perhaps the address ought to speak for itself. So I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a verbatim copy of this address that was taken and notarized by the stenographer as a true and exact copy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am afraid he is making a mistake. If that speech is placed in the RECORD it will be frankable, and they can have millions of copies of it printed and sent out under somebody's frank, who is in sympathy with them, and distribute it all over America. I do not know whether the gentleman has thought about that or not—

Mr. DIRKSEN. The District Committee discussed this matter yesterday and proposes to have a meeting this week for the purpose of further discussion. Obviously, if we are going to arrive at an ultimate conclusion in the matter, the full text of the address should be made available to the Members.

Mr. RANKIN. I have read the speech and I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I have told the head of the school system in the District of Columbia that that principal should be removed, because he knew that woman was a Communist. He had heard her before. He took her out there and imposed her upon the boys and girls at the Western High School. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, but I doubt the advisability of making this speech frankable and embalming it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With extreme deference, I am still of the opinion that the text ought to be made available, because the language must speak for itself. I am of the opinion that this may represent some very subtle propaganda, and the best way to deal with it is to bring it out in the open.

Mr. RANKIN. Further reserving the right to object, let me say that there never has been such a drive against American institutions as the Communists are making in this country today. They insidiously pick out parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which favor them and publicize them throughout the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I rather fancy the matter will be adequately and suitably dealt with when the committee concludes its deliberations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ADDRESS OF MRS. SHURA LEWIS BEFORE WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY, MAY 6, 1947

Introduction (by Mr. Danowsky, principal): "In this world of confusion there is a country about which there is much wondering today. We are particularly fortunate in having a speaker today who was born and raised in the Ural Mountains in that great country—Russia. I have heard her speak on a number of occasions and asked her here today because I know you will enjoy hearing what she has to say."

Mrs. Lewis: "As I came here today I felt myself almost at home because it reminded me of Russia when I went to school there. The general assemblies, students, classes, and teachers brought me back. Right now I feel myself like a pupil."

"I was raised under different conditions. I was born in 1916 in a very small village below the Ural Mountains. There were 70 houses in my village. There were no schools until 1922. My father and mother were farmers and working always in the land. I have three brothers who are older than I am. I graduated from elementary school in my village and after that I was sent to secondary school to another village because in my village there was no school where I could continue my education."

"The secondary school was located about 40 miles from my native village. I studied there for 3 years. That school was called Youth. Here we studied agriculture, history, literature, art, mathematics, and also we paid very much attention how to cultivate the land and how to milk the cows. [Laughter.]

"All the subjects we were trying to learn in that way so we could use it after graduation. As soon as I graduated this school I was 16 years old. At that time the teachers were needed in Russia very badly because a greater number of schools were being opened everywhere. The schools which never exist in the area below the Urals each very much wanted to have

their own schools for their children. The teachers were needed so badly:

"So, at the age of 15 I was as tall as I am now and they thought I am big enough to be a teacher. I thought about it was too young to teach but they say to be able to read and write, to be able to explain ABC's you better start because it was so hard for the Russian Government to provide each school with a teacher."

"It is funny but it is true that teachers needed so I thought about it and accepted this invitation to teach right away in that area. I started the first class at the age of 8 years old because the first class in Russia pupils go to school when they are eight. But before eight they have preschool—kindergarten—nurseries."

"So I started with the first grade, then the second grade was given right away and the third grade because they promised to send another teacher but she never came because they didn't find her. So I started alone by myself in a village."

"Strange, but at that time I was the best educated person in that community. So it was very hard for me to begin that profession. You have to read the theory and you have to know how to conduct the classes. So I worked 2 years in the same village then I was transferred to the same village where I was born and raised. I worked two more years there with three teachers and at the age of 19 I felt that I had not enough education to be a good teacher so I decided to go to continue my education and I chose Moscow."

"My mother, my father did not object, but my mother was exciting about that an objected. She didn't want me to go so far from home. But now I had a deep desire to study. I left my village where to the nearest railroad station it was about 200 miles and I went there partly by horses and partly by truck. So I came to the railroad station for the first time and saw the engine. I was really surprised to see everything at this time. So I took the train in (Chilahi???) and went straight to Moscow."

"I didn't take all my savings with me. They all said when I left 'Be careful with your money. Somebody will take it.'

"At Moscow I began to pass examinations. Education is free in Russia. If you want to be a teacher you go and study. Get the profession of a teacher. If you want to be an engineer, doctor, philosopher, professor, you are just able to do it because it is free. You don't need to pay money. The Government supports the students and gives the scholarships, or 'stipends' (stipenza?) as we call them, for everybody who passes examinations."

"I pass the examination and entered the workers' farm at the school in Russia for adults who were not able to get the right education when they were at my age. So that faculty gave the opportunity for aiding people to get the education they need."

"After 2 years' study in Moscow I took middle education. That would be high school here. After middle education each person can enter the institute—like college here, but a little more than college. Then I entered the Moscow Philological Institute of Foreign Languages."

"I don't know why but I chose English. The main reason was because I heard among the students such conversation. They said to study German is very easy because many sounds in German and Russian are alike, especially the sound r-r-r-olling, like that."

"So the students were discussing about what language to choose and I heard the pupils say, the students in the corridor, the most difficult language is English."

"So I wanted to know why it was difficult. [Laughter.] When we started it was very interesting, because the grammar was entirely different from Russian. English grammar is very difficult, and at the same time

easy. Each has its own disadvantages and advantages.

"So I studied in this Moscow institute for 4 years and I graduated in 1941—just 1 week after the second war started. While I was a student during this 4 years I went twice to Graymi or the rest home. Each Russian person, each citizen, is given medical care free. If you are sick you are given health aids by the hospitals and doctors and you do not need to pay for them. Our trade union of students, they were the students of the whole country, and each person had the opportunity to go once a year to rest in the Graymi—at the shore, to relax and breathe the fresh air and make gymnastics.

"Here the medical care is given by the doctors. You living for a month under the doctors who give you advice about whether you need to gain or lose or strengthen your muscles. Every morning the doctors examine you.

"As soon as I entered the school I got well acquainted with American boy who was working in the American Embassy. I arrived in Moscow in 1937—the same year when I became the student of the institute. We had a wonderful time for 2 years before we got married. [Laughter, applause.]

"Very frequently went to the shows, to the theater and opera in Moscow. There are many theaters which are very good. They have very good ballet, drama, and all kinds of entertainment. We went there almost every week-end.

"The first year he offered me chewing gum and I didn't know what to do. I thought it was candy and I swallowed it. Later on, on my birthday, he gave me a present—a very beautiful box. When I came home—I lived in a dormitory with three girls in the same room—I went to bed, but I was so curious what was like in the box. Technique is much higher in America because Russia was always a backward country and did not produce the luxuries for better living. Just recently Russia is producing any heavy machinery at all. So we had known many things like you have in America—flashlights.

"I came home, put on my pajamas [laughter], and cleaned my teeth. Some people think Russians are ignorant and backward and don't clean their teeth and don't own tooth brushes. It was funny, but it was not funny for me. Several weeks ago I read an article somewhere telling that Russians are so wild savages they never change their underwear until it drops off. [Applause.]

"You call us dirty and of course we will start to fight. Maybe not.

"And so I opened the present, and there was lying beautiful fountain pen with a pencil. What nice present. I was so happy. Then I didn't know how to operate, so there was a little thing on the top, and I push the little thing down, and so the ink go all over my pajamas, sheets, and everything. [Applause.]

"I like America very much, and I am fond of Russia, too. I think these two great countries are really great, but life in both countries is entirely different. Always if you want to study Russia you have to think about Russia of today but not Russia which was a century ago. In Russia of today there are no landlords or businessmen living on rents or profit. The whole land is public property. The whole industry is publicly owned and controlled. Every family of modern Russia must live on earnings from the work. The industry and agriculture are run according to the general plan. If good or bad is full decision.

"They call it collective farm—the peasants farm and divide up products according to work put in by each individual during the year. As a result of planning, unemployment is completely wiped out and has shown no signs of returning. At the present moment in Russia more and more workers are needed, especially field workers.

"They are needed scientists, professors, teachers, doctors, and no matter how much they train them they still need them more.

"In Russia right now people absolutely do not worry about today or tomorrow. They never think 'All of a sudden I lose a job.' That fear doesn't exist among Russian people.

"Russia plans not only for production to increase but also to increase the health and culture level of the people. They work according to the plan. How many schools to open, how many hospitals and they do it according to plan. So in Russia equal right is granted to each nationality. There is no discrimination. Nobody says you are Negro, you are Jew. They don't say you are Jew or Tartar. In Russia right now live 189 different people and 111 languages are spoken.

"For many years many nationalities never had schools or had their alphabets. Now they do have. Science is taught in their native language.

"Women in Russia is given the same rights politically, economically, and culturally, the same right. Women elect and can be elected. The women in Russia is encouraged to have a career and also there is freedom for women. If she wants to be a housewife and raise a child and home she is more than welcome. She may do that.

"At the present moment pupils discuss about Russia everywhere, especially about the two policies and they all blame Russia at Moscow Conference just because Russia is so they don't want to agree. But people always forget for Russia her reparations from Germany. They always forget that during the war Germans made of great ruins for Russia about 679 million rubles it was destroyed 31 the factories and plants, it was ruined 65,000 kilometers of railroads, it was destroyed 1,719 towns and 70,000 villages and 6,000,000 houses destroyed so 25,000,000 of people in Russia remains without shelter.

"When you read these figures you don't need to blame Russia for demanding reparations from the Germans.

"The Russian people, as Americans, are fond of all kinds of sports, skiing, skating, baseball, football, tennis. But baseball isn't very popular yet. Climbing up the mountain, dancing, gymnastics. This last sport is very highly developed.

"Most people blame the Russian Government for not believing in God.

"It is not true. The Russian people are religious and really when they pray they really mean it. Very often we talk about religion and morals. Religion without morals is not religion. Millions of Russians are very good. They want to have good families. Each man or wife had a responsibility for the family. They cannot get a divorce very easily just because the wife doesn't like the husband. It is against the law to be separated. In Russia the family is like a unit. You pay fees before you get a divorce. The fees are a little high. If you get your first you pay 300 rubles, second 1,000 rubles and third 3,000 rubles. But nobody has 3,000 rubles so you won't be able to get the divorce.

"Before the revolution religion in Russia belonged to the group of people who were always trying to work the church to prevent the science from the people. I don't want to discuss much but I want to tell you one fact.

"In my village it was no school, but there was a lovely church. All people went to the church. I was 7 or 6 years old when my mother said, 'Hurry, let's go, we go now to pray. All people go to pray to God to send the rain.' All the population of the village gathered near the church. Here they took their ikons and all went singing into the fields, and they prayed and prayed for God to send the rain. There was no rain, no bread. So the Russian people prayed for rain.

"And when we come home I was so tired, and everybody was, and within 2 or 3 hours it

started to pour, heavy rain. Everybody was so happy the rain is given. Especially the preacher was very proud of himself. [Laughter.] And later on a little thing was discovered in his bedroom, and that little thing was called a barometer. [Applause.]

"Right now you can go to that village and ask a child of kindergarten age what a barometer is. He will tell you. But at that time even my parents didn't know about this. Religion must be together with science. Education for all, freedom for all, without any discriminations. Then religion will go hand by hand with science and with peace.

"Three years ago I arrived in this country. As soon as I came here my husband was drafted right away into the Army immediately. I stayed here alone with two children. The first son, Eric, was born in Russia. When the time came for me to go to the hospital my husband took me, and I stayed 2 weeks. Medical care is given, food, and all expense. It did not cost me a penny. When my husband came to take me home, and the nurse was giving the little baby to my husband, because it was the Russian custom husbands must carry the baby home. [Applause.] When my husband stretched his arms he didn't know what to do. He put his arms in his pocket to make out a check. And the nurse say, 'Pardon me, this is your own baby. We don't sell babies in this hospital.' [Applause.]

"As soon as I came to America just 2 months later another baby was born in this country. I went to the hospital and was remained there 2 weeks, but I paid \$120. So I want to tell you it is hard to live in any country. You have to work, especially if you have no money and your parents aren't rich—when you have to live by working.

"No matter where you live you have to work. What the Russian people have, they are more secure about this. They work. They need not worry much about losing the job. They are free to travel from one place to another, and each citizen must work 25 years for after that he is able to get a pension. No matter where you work—in this plant or another, 25 years and then you get 50 percent of your salary and live the rest of your life.

"Unless you have children and all your children are educated and get professions or jobs. Then you live like a queen.

"I want just to mention that Russian educational system has its own history. At the beginning there was complete chaos. No teachers. All the old teachers were afraid after the revolution. They were afraid and didn't know what method to use. Especially after the revolution there was very great hunger, starvation, and those 2 or 3 years were just terrible. At this time Lenin told us that we have to start education for everybody and develop your own system.

"Schools were opened for everybody and everybody for schools. Russian coeducational life has its own history. They tried all methods to improve education. They tried an American system, from a lady in Dayton, Ohio, mental project and all kinds of methods for trying. Finally they decided that the lessons and the teachers is the main factor in education.

"The teachers in Russia remain at such a level which never before. During 12 years the salary of the teacher has been increased 300 percent.

"I want to mention that intellectual work—teachers, engineers, executives, especially those who work mentally, are paid much higher than the hard labor, just because to encourage the people to increase their educational level, to improve the professions and to be useful more in the society.

"You know in Russia the people don't suffer very much from toothaches. I don't know why, but very seldom you go to the dentist. I think Russian people eat so much vegetables and black bread. When I came here my

friends advised me to go to the dentist. So I went to the dentist and opened my mouth and he told me—I am 33 now and have no cavities in my mouth. He told me he would have to pull four wisdom teeth out. I said why were they dead? He said 'No, no, but they might give you trouble in the future.'

"So I gave him \$10 for telling me this. I never went from that time to this. I will go when I have real trouble. I never appreciated the life in Russia until I live here. Here you have to work hard in order to live, use all your courage not to die." [Applause.]

(Mr. Danowsky announces a period of questioning will follow:)

Question (by a young red-haired girl). "How does the ruble compare with the American dollar?"

Answer. "Officially \$1 costs 5 rubles. But diplomats get 12 rubles."

Question (by a young man in khaki clothes). "If Russia really wants world peace why doesn't she allow us to see what resources she has?"

Answer. "A very interesting question. This question bothers me and the whole world. The Russian people always desire and need peace. I read both languages, Russian and English. I read all the papers here and occasionally I go to the Library of Congress and read all papers printed in Moscow. It is very interesting, and when I read these papers always you can see here evidence of press where people talk all the time about having a war, to throw the atomic bomb on Russia, to destroy because they have a system which is very prideful. At the present time Russians are busy to restore all those houses, all those cities, all those towns. Russian people make streets, plants, produce new style of shoes, new fashion of dress, new production, and never they talk about having a war. If you read the papers about 2 or 3 days ago, it was printed in the Washington Post an interview of Stalin with Stassen and Stalin said in spite of the fact that so great countries have different system they can and are able to cooperate and live peacefully because it is a desire of the people."

Question. "Does Russia's system of free hospitalization compare with our free clinics for the poor?"

Mr. Danowsky: "Assembly is ended. It is time for class periods."

(Note.—This transcript is an exact record of stenographic notes and no attempt has been made to correct grammar or construction.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 16, 1947.

Elizabeth Imus Shelton personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, and made oath that the above is a "stenographic transcript of the address of Mrs. Shura Lewis before the Western High School assembly on May 6, 1947.

My commission expires May 1, 1950.

Elizabeth Imus Shelton
ELIZABETH IMUS SHELTON,
Mabel Goodwin Haller

[SEAL] MABEL GOODWIN HALLER,
Notary Public.

HENRY BIG DAY—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 262)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 193, "An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "1902" insert ": Provided, That all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act from lands within the naval petroleum reserves shall be deposited in the Treasury as 'miscellaneous receipts', as provided by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813), as amended June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252, 34 U. S. C., sec. 524)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERECTION AND OPERATION OF MEMORIAL MUSEUM AND SHOP ON THE FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1584, "An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "supervised, managed, and controlled by" and insert "operated by the said tribes under supervision, management, and control of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, to Adolph Pfannenstiehl, the sum of _____ out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, loss of wages, and medical and hospital expenses as a result of being knocked through a plate-glass window at 82 Summer Street, Boston, Mass., on September 23, 1943, by an employee of the Navy Department: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, at the beginning of the line, insert "\$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. ORVILLE C. MCKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CHARLES F. BARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2631) for the relief of Charles F. Barrett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ROGER EDGAR LAPIERRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 436) for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien, Roger Edgar Lapierre, of Lewiston, Maine, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such future warrants or orders are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws such alien shall be considered to have been, at Island Pond, Vt., on the date of his entry in 1927, lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FREDERICK FABER WESCHE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2915) for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell), the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWSON ASHBY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 408) for the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,774.77 to Lawson Ashby, of Trinidad, Calif.; the sum of \$1,000 to Mrs. Ora Ashby, of Trinidad, Calif.; the sum of \$2,500 to the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; the sum of \$2,500 to the legal guardian of Darrel Ashby, a minor; the sum of \$2,500 to the legal guardian of Kenneth Ashby, a minor; the sum of \$1,000 to the legal guardian of Vernon Ashby, a minor; such payments being in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, losses, and expenses arising out of an accident which occurred on October 3, 1942, near McKinley-

ville, Calif., and which involved an Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "2,500"; insert in lieu thereof "1,000." Page 2, line 1, strike out "2,500"; insert in lieu thereof "1,000." Page 2, line 2, strike out "1,000"; insert in lieu thereof "300." Amend the title so as to read "For the relief of Lawson Ashby; Mrs. Ora Ashby; and the legal guardian of Betty Mae Ashby, a minor; Darrel Ashby, a minor; Kenneth Ashby, a minor; and Vernon Ashby, a minor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBERT W. ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 651) for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Rubert W. Alexander, Des Moines, Iowa, the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said estate of Rubert W. Alexander against the United States for severe personal injuries he sustained as the result of the crash on February 6, 1943, of a plane operated under the Air Transport Command of the United States Army Air Forces in which he was being returned to the United States because of ill health after being employed by the United States engineer office at Anchorage, Alaska.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the sign "\$" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof—"5,647.97, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, property damages, and losses sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by the late Rubert W. Alexander as a result of the crash on or about February 6, 1943, of an Army airplane, in which he was a passenger, at Watson Lake, Canada: *Provided*, That the said estate of Rubert W. Alexander, deceased, be, and it is hereby, relieved of all obligations to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,439.66 heretofore paid for the benefit of Mr. Alexander by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission as a result of this accident: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUGUSTA MCCALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of Mrs. Augusta McCall.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,000, to Mrs. Augusta McCall, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered by her when she was struck by a Government truck in San Antonio, Tex., on July 7, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out "\$3,000"; insert in lieu thereof "\$500."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE LANDING TOWNSHIP, HYDE COUNTY, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of determinations reported to the Congress by the Acting Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain claimants on account of loss by fire for which the United States was adjudged liable," approved August 13, 1940, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owners of the following lands in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C., the following sums, such sums to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage or loss sustained by such persons as a result of the forest fire or fires which burned land and timber of the Pamlico Timber Corp. (in the case of which fire or fires the United States, on August 2, 1937, was held liable, in a proceeding in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, for damage suffered by certain persons specified in such act of August 13, 1940):

M. Makely and George Makely, 60 acres, \$300; Mary Windley Willis, 14 acres, \$70; Mrs. Thomas G. Weston, 2 acres, \$35; Mrs. Rena S. Jennette, S. E. Jennette, T. A. Jennette, and Mrs. W. H. Robbins, 30 acres, \$300; Lenus Benson, Marvin Benson, Arreal Benson, Sill Benson, and Viola Benson, one-half interest

in 30 acres, \$75; T. J. Mann, two-thirds interest in 100 acres, \$660.66; Mary E. Credle heirs, 42 acres, \$420; Miss Lucy Saddler, 30 acres, \$230; Etheline Ballance and Bernice Ballance, 69 acres, \$345; Tom C. Spencer heirs, 5 acres, \$50; Emma B. Powell, one-half interest in 30 acres, \$75; J. E. Berry, Sr., Estate, 35 acres, \$280; Mrs. Eitha Mason Payne, Mrs. Eugenia Mason Warren, Zinkia Mason Credle, W. T. Mason, Caddie Mason Hooper, Alex W. Mason, and C. R. Mason, 40 acres, \$200; Mrs. Charlie Gibbs, 7½ acres, \$48.75; Edward A. Carawan, 19½ acres, \$143; E. W. Farrow, 10 acres, \$100; J. M. Pugh, 3½ acres, \$35; Ola Lucas Spencer, 8 acres, \$55; J. S. Mann and E. D. Sewells, two-thirds interest in 50 acres, \$694; W. H. Farrow and Charlie E. Spencer heirs (claims cover the same tract, W. H. Farrow claiming present ownership of the land) 59 acres, \$317: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRON R. LEARD

The Clerk called the bill, H. R. 893, for the relief of Myron R. Leard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Myron R. Leard, of Colbert, Ga., the sum of \$187.15. The payment of such sum shall be in reimbursement of the amount the said Myron R. Leard, as acting postmaster, paid the Government for loss of money and stamps resulting from robbery of the Colbert, Ga., post office on July 9, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, insert "full settlement of all claims against the United States as."

Page 2, line 1, after "1944", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Y. S. HU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Y. S. Hu.

Mr. POTTS and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A. J. CROZAT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill, H. R. 984, for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of \$15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the armed forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$7,026.38."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY, DECEASED, AND ESTATE OF LOUISA COWLEY, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 989) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INGA PATTERSON, WIDOW OF F. X. PATTERSON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUGUST W. DIETZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of August W. Dietz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500 to August W. Dietz, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage suffered by him when his automobile was struck by a Government truck in San Antonio, Tex., on May 28, 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$6,000."

Page 2, line 1, after "1940", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN C. GARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of John C. Garrett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against John C. Garrett, a former employee of the Federal Public Housing Authority, in the amount of \$1,520.71, and with respect to housing projects designated Florida 8101, 8104, 8105, and 8106 located at Panama City, Fla., together with the interest due on said amount from the day of the loss of public funds for which said John C. Garrett is accountable and which were stolen without his fault from his person while he was performing his duties as agent cashier for said projects. Said John C. Garrett is hereby relieved of pecuniary responsibility for the loss of said public funds.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts, not exceeding the sum stated in section 1 hereof, as may be necessary to relieve said former chief

disbursing officer of financial liability on account of the loss of said sum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MARION S. GRIGGS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of the estate of Marion S. Griggs, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Marion S. Griggs, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained in July 1934, while boarding a United States Army truck for the purpose of transportation to Fort Devens, Mass., to resume her duties as camp hostess, said injuries causing her death on January 3, 1937: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LESLIE PRICE, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1586) for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Leslie Price, the sum of \$1,557.50; to Philip C. Price, the sum of \$1,307.50; to Annie Curry, the sum of \$1,000; to James Curry, the sum of \$1,150.20; all of Donovan, Ga.; and to Mrs. Louise Keyton, of Wrightsville, Ga., the sum of \$1,090, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision of a car belonging to Mrs. Leslie Price and an Army vehicle on April 4, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$1,557.50" and insert "\$1,007.50."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,307.50" and insert "\$807.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$567.19."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$1,150.20" and insert "\$656.26."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$1,090" and insert "\$590."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUBA COUNTY, CALIF., DISTRICT NO. 10

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 261) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon the claims of all persons against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which damage, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable only to the extent to which a private person would be liable under like circumstances.

SEC. 2. Suits upon which such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41 (20)).

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge to the Daughters of the American Revolution last night in Constitution Hall.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss with the ranking

minority member of the Committee on Appropriations the matter of the disposition of time, and how long he thinks we ought to occupy in general debate and when he thinks we ought to commence reading the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as requests are concerned, I think we can expedite the time. I think 2 hours of general debate, to be equally divided, will be satisfactory.

Mr. PLUMLEY. To be perfectly frank with the House, inasmuch as prolonged debate involves a greater expenditure of money, and since I have only one request for time, I am in agreement with the suggestion of the gentleman that debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California and myself.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. PLUMLEY. And as to whether or not we shall commence the reading of the bill tonight, that will be left to fate to determine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3493, with Mr. ARENS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require. Mr. Chairman, I desire to acknowledge my obligation to each and every member of the subcommittee for their long-suffering close cooperation, and to Ken Sprinkle for the very efficient manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office as executive secretary.

The Navy Department appropriation bill, as it is presented to you today, is the first budget for the Navy which approximates anything like a normal operating budget, free of war charges. While the conversion from a wartime to a peacetime basis is not yet completed and has not been accomplished, it has reached the point where the remaining conversion tasks are minor in character both as to the job to be done and as to the costs thereof.

The subcommittee which handled the bill commenced its hearings on the 21st day of January. Events over which it had no control necessarily interrupted and postponed the hearings from time to time until only recently was the subcommittee able to mark up the bill and make its report to the full committee.

The report is unanimous, though necessarily the result of compromise as to the figures ultimately agreed upon.

With the exception of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SCRIVNER) and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. D'Aleandro, who since their appointment have rendered able and outstanding service, the subcommittee is composed of

practically the same men who have comprised it during the war years, supporting the Navy unlimitedly and backing with every possible means its effort to win the war.

We feel, therefore, that we are permitted to assume and to assert that in times of peace we are competent to recommend the program to be followed presently by the Navy with respect to necessary expenditure of the taxpayers' money in order to maintain its supremacy. We are proud of what the Navy has accomplished and of our contribution to that end.

The committee recalls the necessary supplementary and deficiency bills enacted to furnish the money to win the war. It is equally sure that if and when an emergency arises the Congress will, if necessary, appropriate the needed funds by supplementary action to the bill which we now present. We, in our judgment, have appropriated all the money the Navy can presently use. Should anything happen after Congress adjourns to necessitate the calling of a special session, the President has the power and authority to act in the premise.

We have not jeopardized in the slightest degree the supremacy of the United States Navy nor the adequate maintenance of a Navy competent to do the job. The committee gave its most careful scrutiny to every item in order to insure a Navy sufficiently strong to protect the United States in the event of any emergency or catastrophe, while at the same time it endeavored to bring the necessary expenditures to as low a point as possible and thereby ease the burden of the taxpayers. That this latter task was not easy to accomplish, while at the same time undertaking to assure the provision and maintenance of that kind of a Navy which the United States must maintain for the time being at least, is obvious.

In the years to come it is to be hoped that the Navy and the Army may be reduced to a fraction of their present size without depriving the country of its position in world affairs, which it will have to continue to occupy in order to discharge the obligations of its destiny.

Until we can be certain that the safety of the United States will not be jeopardized, I can assure you the committee will always urge adequate appropriations for sufficient naval defense.

As I have said, those of us who have served on this committee throughout the war feel we do not have to justify before the House the statement that we have always furnished the necessary appropriations and that we will continue to undertake so to do as we strive to maintain our well-considered judgment that the best defense for this country is an adequate offense, which program this bill seeks to support and to accomplish.

In our best judgment, the bill does not make it necessary to take a ship off the seas nor an airplane out of the air. We have backed research and reserve programs to the limit. We have reduced unnecessary civilian personnel and top-heavy high command. We have sug-

gested that too many people on shore duty do not necessarily contribute to the staffing of ships at sea.

I do not propose to labor my statement with details nor to be prolix. You have had an opportunity to read the report and the hearings and the bill are before you.

You should be advised that, in addition to the regular budget, the committee considered three supplemental requests which came to us during the course of the hearings, which, over all, requested a current total of \$3,847,280,300. As explained on page 2 of the report, \$170,000,000 of this total was requested in the form of contract authority and \$164,280,000 was requested as transfers from other Navy funds. The total amount of new appropriations requested from the Treasury was \$3,513,000,300.

The committee has approved in full the requests for contract authority and transfers, but has reduced the request for new cash in the amount of \$377,519,200. Adding to this figure the transfer and contract authority, we find that the bill carries a total available to the Navy from all sources of \$3,469,761,100, which, in our opinion, is all it needs at the present.

For your information, let me call attention to an additional feature in regard to Navy expenditures which has considerable bearing on the Navy program for the next year or two. On the 2d of last August the President issued an order, which is commonly known today as the stop-spend order, whereby he deferred for many Government departments the expenditure of a considerable amount of money during the fiscal year 1947. Insofar as the Navy is concerned, the amount so deferred was carried at \$650,000,000. On page 2 of the report you will find a table indicating the planned disposition of these funds.

May I direct your attention to the fact that there is now available to the Navy in excess of \$231,000,000 for expenditure during 1948 and 1949, in addition to which there are transfers provided in the bill of nearly \$116,000,000. This makes a total expenditure figure in sight of about \$3,700,000,000. After considering the over-all program of the Navy, your committee is of the opinion that this amount does not restrict the Navy program to any degree such as to jeopardize its supremacy and effective operation.

ELIMINATION OF SURPLUS LANGUAGE

Another feature of this year's bill is the elimination of a considerable amount of language as compared with the bills that have gone through in previous years. The elimination of this language has been made possible as a result of action instituted 2 or 3 years ago by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who was then serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. He urged the Navy strongly at that time, and has on many occasions since urged them, to go to the legislative committee and obtain substantive law to carry out their program. As a result, Congress last year passed what is now known as Public Law

604 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which cleaned up, so to speak, countless items that have been carried from year to year in the annual appropriation bill.

It is certainly a pleasure to see the bill cleaned up in this manner, and, while I do not attempt to say what other departments of the Government should do, I might toss out the suggestion that it would be well for some of them to follow the Navy's example in this respect.

FLEET

The 1948 estimates are based upon a fleet in active status which is not a great deal larger in numbers than the 1939 fleet, but for efficiency and fighting strength the two fleets would not be in the same category. The present fleet is modern and up to date, with the best equipment developed during the last war. It is supported by various types of auxiliary and amphibious craft, many of which were not in existence in 1939.

In this connection, one of the most desirable features from the standpoint of the taxpayer is that the present fleet, being new as it is, should not require nearly so great a maintenance expenditure as was required to keep the 1939 fleet serviceably afloat, because that fleet had a large number of vessels which were several years old and practically worn out, with the result that they required a much greater expenditure for maintenance.

The committee has approved a transfer of funds in the amount of \$14,280,000 from the appropriation for increase and replacement of naval vessels in order to allow the Navy to get started on a program of building, small in scale, to provide certain submarines and other types of vessels which will incorporate certain requirements and ideas that have arisen as a result of the war. We do not desire to see any huge shipbuilding program underway at this time, but we do want to proceed on a small scale in order to develop the ideas now in mind and so that we may have the knowledge that can be furnished only after tests of these prototypes have been conducted.

SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

The Navy expanded its shore establishments many times during the war. We all realize the necessity for that action and the benefits derived. However, this country cannot go on in peacetime maintaining those establishments anywhere near the size and number that the Navy required during the war. That is obvious. It is absolutely necessary to reduce the number and the personnel. It is not a pleasant task to cut down on anything like this, because it means that certain districts here and there will lose activities to which they have been accustomed in the last 3 or 4 years. Nevertheless, it must be done. It is with that in mind that the committee has cut the appropriations which contribute to the support of the Shore Establishment. We wish the Navy to move promptly to reduce its Shore Establishment. In furtherance of this program steps have already been inaugurated by the Secretary of the Navy in his assignment to the

General Board of the task of reviewing the entire shore plant.

In our report we said:

The committee believes that substantial savings can be accomplished by the reduction of shore activities of the Navy. There are entirely too many of these facilities scattered over the country. Most of them were emergency wartime construction and were extremely necessary at the time, but the operation of so large a number for the smaller peacetime Navy is wholly uneconomical and presents administrative problems which can be greatly simplified by reductions in the number of stations. It is up to the Navy to close many of these shore stations at the earliest possible date. A considerable portion of the reductions in the bill can be absorbed by the Navy without reducing essential naval activities if it will take steps without delay to cut down the size of the Shore Establishment.

The committee expects the Navy to live within the amounts provided in this bill and believes it can be done without sacrificing any of the efficiency of the fleet, by taking positive steps in line with the foregoing paragraph.

It has been noted that a survey is under way for the purpose of determining which activities can best be closed. It is desired that the results of this survey be available at an early date. The determinations thereof should be made not upon the basis of political or sectional desires but rather upon the basis of efficient and economical distribution of installations which are of greatest value from a military standpoint. This applies equally to ordnance plants, aeronautical facilities, training activities, and practically all other types of shore installations.

The committee is advised that the General Board is giving its primary attention to this problem and desires to urge upon the Board that it expedite action and secure early results. The number of stations in active status on June 30, 1947, according to a table on page 1777 of the hearings is estimated to be 1,925. This number is expected to be reduced by only 71 during the fiscal year to a total of 1,854 on June 30, 1948. It is the judgment of the committee that much greater reductions can be accomplished and the committee expects to inquire into the matter during the year and to have a full report from the General Board as to its accomplishments in connection with the hearings on the 1949 budget.

To the foregoing should have been added this statement:

In future allocations or dispositions of presently used naval air training centers or airfields, the committee strongly urges that areas be considered, with their training possibilities, so that one area will not be unduly favored against another.

The above statement was omitted through inadvertence, and the attention of the Navy is specifically called to it and to the fact that the committee expects the Navy to consider the statement as part of the committee's report on the bill.

RESEARCH

The committee has approved in full the budget estimate for research of \$34,400,000. The records show that this committee has for many years gone all-out on the subject or research, knowing that our successful operations in future wars depended upon obtaining successful results from research activities.

In addition to the specific appropriation which I have mentioned, the com-

mittee has set aside \$75,000,000 for research in the Bureau of Aeronautics, which is the full amount of the budget request on that subject. Furthermore, the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance have between them about \$90,000,000 set up for research work, and the committee feels, as stated on page 6 of the report, that the Navy should not absorb any of the reductions that we have made by cutting down on the research program.

I might call your attention to the fact that the bill provides in excess of \$203,000,000 for research activity for the Navy alone. In addition to this, the Navy has available for expenditure in 1948, according to its own estimates, a little over \$306,000,000 heretofore appropriated for research.

BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

As far as the Bureau of Naval Personnel is concerned, the committee reduced the request to the tune of something over \$6,000,000, \$3,000,000 of which measures the amount deducted from the amount for officer training. The committee approved \$12,000,000 for that specific program, which amount was and is 12 times the amount obligated for the current fiscal year up to the end of March.

The program has the full endorsement of the committee, but the committee is of the opinion that \$12,000,000 is all that can be reasonably spent during 1948.

With respect to the Naval Reserve, it may be said that the full amount of the budget estimate is included in the bill, since the committee realized the importance and almost necessity of maintaining a strong Reserve interested and active in naval affairs.

As far as the Naval Academy is concerned, it is the judgment of the committee that too many enlisted men are now on duty at the Academy. In 1939 there were 2,300 midshipmen and 736 enlisted men. At the present time there are 2,900 midshipmen and over 1,600 enlisted men.

BUREAU OF SHIPS

This brings us to the Bureau of Ships. Let me quote from our report:

The committee has reduced the request for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, from \$374,750,000 to \$300,000,000, and in addition has authorized the transfer as proposed by the Budget, of not to exceed \$50,000,000 from the naval stock fund so that there will actually be new funds in the amount of \$350,000,000 available for the program of this Bureau in the fiscal year 1948. In addition to this, the Bureau will have for expenditure in 1948, \$14,800,000 from 1947 appropriations, which amount represents deferred expenditures pursuant to the President's stop-spend order of August 2, 1946.

This makes a total of \$364,800,000 available for 1948 as compared with \$394,950,000, the amount remaining for 1947 after the President's order of August 2, 1946. The fiscal year 1947 appropriation carried a considerable burden of the cost of reconversion and of laying up the reserve fleet, which program will be largely completed in the next few months and costs of which are materially reduced in 1948.

As of March 31 the Department had incurred obligations of \$225,666,219 against the funds available of \$394,950,000 for the year.

At this rate the total obligations for the year would be about \$301,000,000. As of March 31, in addition to the obligations above referred to, there were commitments outstanding of \$74,206,497. These commitments added to the actual obligations projected on an annual basis attain a total of \$375,000,000 for the entire year leaving a margin of approximately \$20,000,000 to take care of other items. At this late date in the fiscal year 1947, it is fair to assume that additional commitments chargeable against the 1947 appropriations will leave a considerable margin. Taking this fact and the early completion of the reconversion and lay-up program into account, it is altogether logical to expect that the amount approved by the committee, plus the deferred expenditures, a total of \$364,800,000, will meet all necessary requirements in 1948.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

The committee has reduced the budget estimate of \$208,000,000 for ordnance and ordnance stores by \$28,000,000 and is recommending in our bill \$180,000,000. It so happens that this reduction is almost exactly the same amount that was deferred by the President last August, and it seems to me that there can certainly be no harm in continuing that deferment, which is practically what the bill provides.

The committee feels that the Bureau of Ordnance can and should make considerable progress in reducing its shore establishment. It is operating many plants at only a small fraction of their capacity, and anyone at all familiar with the subject realizes that operations under such conditions are of the most costly type. We feel that it would be much more economical for the Bureau to operate fewer plants at a greater percentage of their capacity than it is now doing, and place others which might be needed in a caretaker status or make other suitable disposition of them.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

The largest item in the total of \$1,484,000,000 recommended for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is the item of \$1,200,000,000 for pay and subsistence. Actually, there will be available for this appropriation \$1,250,000,000 as a result of the committee's recommending \$50,000,000 to be transferred to the subsistence subhead from the clothing and small stores fund. This represents an over-all reduction on pay of about 7 percent and would ordinarily mean a reduction in numbers of personnel of about 7 percent below the estimated average which called for 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers. However, the application of this reduction is left to the Navy Department. They can absorb some of this cut by administrative action on matters such as flight pay, promotions, and so forth.

Then, there are approximately 20,000 men assigned to activities ashore which activities will be terminated. In the opinion of the committee too large a percentage of the total enlisted personnel is on shore duty.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

So far as the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery is concerned we have allowed \$2,000,000 more than was appropriated in 1947, appreciating the very fine type of work which has been done by the

Bureau and the position which it occupies in scientific and medical circles.

There can be no question but that by closer coordination with the Army and with the Veterans' Administration considerable savings could be made, for there are entirely too many vacant beds in naval hospitals while the Army and Veterans' Administration are requesting additional facilities.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

So far as the Bureau of Yards and Docks is involved, while the appropriation is \$13,000,000, in round numbers, less than the estimate, it is only \$4,700,000 below the current year's appropriation.

There is no construction of new public works contemplated until after legislative authorization therefor has been obtained. The committee is of the opinion that the deactivation of shore establishments will render the proposed appropriation sufficient.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

The committee has allowed \$90,000,000 for new construction and the procurement of aircraft and equipment by the Bureau of Aeronautics, while also approving the recommendation of the Budget for the expenditure of \$170,000,000 additional for the purchase of equipment which is covered by contract authority.

In addition to this, an appropriation of \$75,000,000 is made for research, and \$291,000,000 for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft, which should be sufficient.

MARINE CORPS

We have reduced the appropriation estimate of \$209,000,000 for pay of the Marine Corps to \$189,128,000 which reduction is approximately in line with that applied to Navy pay.

The committee was not impressed by the progress which the Marine Corps had made as of the current fiscal year with respect to its Reserve program but has approved the full amount requested, hoping that some extra effort will be made by the Marine Corps with respect to the maintenance and the operation of its Reserve program.

In the opinion of the committee, the Marine Corps, in common with the Navy, should defer the purchase of clothing, fuel, and military stores to the greatest extent possible as against the large quantities of such articles which they have carried over from the war years and as against the high prices prevalent at the present time.

SALARIES

The cut in salaries for the Navy Department is something like 25 percent below the budget estimate but is really only about 16 percent below the amount appropriated for 1947. Back in 1939, when there were 142,000 military personnel, the Navy Department employed 3,176 civilians in the Department. With 571,000 average military personnel, including the Marine Corps, as planned for 1948, the estimate calls for 15,000 civilian employees, for which increase the committee can see no justification. It does

not follow that the ratio of civilian to military personnel should be parallel. It is argued with a considerable degree of merit that the larger the military personnel, the smaller should be the civilian ratio.

In conclusion may I say that your committee was confronted by situations unusual in their nature, none of which could be considered on the basis of facts established. Many of the things the committee knows in strict confidence cannot be spread upon the record.

The Russian situation; the Greek-Turkish situation; the inactivation and moth-balling of serviceable ships; the maintenance of some shore stations, the abandonment of others; these and countless other items which appear and do not appear in the printed hearings, covered discussions and hearings lasting intermittently and consecutively from January 21 until a week ago. The committee gave to all of these matters their very deepest thought and most careful consideration in open and in executive hearings.

You will, I am sure, support your committee which has given so unstintingly of its time to bring to you this bill which we feel deserves the unanimous support of this House.

Your committee has had in mind constantly the thought so well expressed in the poem of Arthur Harold:

Do not rejoice that you have found the key,
Do not cry blindly that the war is done,
That victory comes quickly, men are free,
And earth's long torment has an end! The sun

That shone on Carthage shines the same, the stars

That saw Atlantis sink beneath the sea
Observe this newest rise. This path of ours
Was used before, and used again shall be.

Do not rejoice that you have reached the gates

And in your hands the scepter of the skies—

Far greater ones before you stunned the fates
And reached out boldly for the godly prize,
To find a scarecrow on the throne sublime
And cold winds blowing down the lanes of time!

The committee has done the best it could after these months of weary worry and work in an attempt to be practical as well as to be prophets.

The bill is in your hands.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On that point of legislation on an appropriation bill, I wonder if the gentleman would care to advise us as to whether the bill now before the committee carries any legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The bill before the committee has not in it, according to my best judgment, any single item which is subject to a point of order.

Further, in response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], I would like to add that I think the example which this committee has set, with respect to encouraging legislative enactment of substantive law in order to avoid the possibility or necessity for attempting to

carry in any appropriation bill language that is legislative in character, might well be followed.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, I concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman has said and in the attitude which he and his committee have taken in years past on the question of attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills. I felt reasonably certain that there would be no such riders on this bill, but to make sure of it, and for the purposes of the Record, I raised the question, and I am glad to have the gentleman's reply.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I take no personal credit for the situation which obtains, but shine in the reflected glory of my former chairman who was so insistent, and with whom I cooperated, to the end that this bill, so far as I know, has not in it one single item subject to a point of order on the basis of the fact that it is legislation contained in an appropriation bill.

I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it should be said also that this bill is quite a revision of the type of bill we have seen coming in here in previous years. Much of the material is a matter of permanent legislation, so the bill is simplified and much more easily understood, and is strictly an appropriation bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the gentleman discuss the item of officer candidate training under the plan known as the Halloway plan. It is my information that the Bureau of the Budget recommended a total of \$15,000,000, and that the committee reduced that amount by \$3,000,000 to \$12,000,000, and I am told by those who have the responsibility of this training program that that reduction of \$3,000,000 will result in the Navy being unable to matriculate some 3,000 students who have previously been screened and who have just recently been selected and who, if the money were available, would go to colleges this summer. I would like to have the gentleman discuss that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Without committing the members of the subcommittee in the slightest degree with respect to this matter, I understand—and I may want to strike this out of the Record, but this is my information in regard to it—this program has been handled by some men who are authorities in their fields so far as Reserve Officer Training Corps Navy men are concerned, but who are awfully poor mathematicians. Twice, to my knowledge, they brought statements to this committee, neither one of which checks with the other so far as the monetary end of it is concerned. However, they have recently produced facts to show that

some 50,000 young men were contacted with respect to the possibility of taking this training, out of which some 40,000 made application, out of which, after several screenings 3,000 men have been found both mentally and physically qualified to take this course. If it be true—and we will undertake to satisfy ourselves with respect to that matter between now and tomorrow when the bill comes up for amendment—that we inadvertently have knocked a leg off this baby of ours, I am sure the committee will be glad to have either an amputation or else put some kind of a leg there to make this baby walk, because we are reasonable. But, you understand, as well as I do, just the situation which confronts me and which confronted the committee. We started out on a program and we gave them twice; 12 to 1.

Mr. COLE of New York. The report so states, but the statement about the ratio of 12 to 1 is so ambiguous and vague that to my mind it is meaningless.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not think the gentleman would want to say that.

Mr. COLE of New York. At least, to my mind it is meaningless. Perhaps to some reasonable man it may have some meaning. At any rate, the gentleman can assure us that it was not the intention of the committee to curtail this program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I can assure the gentleman it is not our intent to cripple the program. It is our intent to go along with the program. When they showed us that they were unable to expand only one 1 out of 12, we appropriated 12 times 1 for the next year.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then if the gentleman and his committee can be shown that this reduction of \$3,000,000 will result in the inability of the Navy to have sufficient funds with which to send these boys to school, the committee will be ready to restore the amount?

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is asking an awful lot of me as chairman to assure him of that, but if he can produce the facts and show us that there are 3,000 boys screened out of 50,000 who will be deprived, by reason of our lack of appropriation of \$3,000,000, or whatever it may be, of their opportunity, the members of my committee, being reasonable human beings, I have a right to assume would consider very carefully, at least, such an amendment as the gentleman may care to offer.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman's explanation and expression of the committee's attitude is what I expected it would be, and I compliment him for it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. There can be no question as to the attitude of the committee.

Mr. MUHLBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLBERG. May I ask, for the purpose of the record, whether when this item was being considered the Committee on Appropriations took into account the number of vessels that might be available for the training of these new officers and the equipment that might be available for them to be trained with?

Mr. PLUMLEY. As I recall, that angle of the situation was very well covered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will yield, may I say in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that with all of the laid-up ships we have I am satisfied they would be taken care of, because there is an ample supply of ships for that purpose.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am satisfied that is the case.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I correctly understand that the regiment at Annapolis is now 2,900 men?

Mr. PLUMLEY. In round numbers.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that compare favorably with the regiment that was there during the war years, or is it reduced?

Mr. PLUMLEY. In 1939 there were 2,300 there.

Mr. DONDERO. But during the war years that increased?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Naturally so. I do not know the number. Does anybody here know the number of cadets at Annapolis during the war years? Of course, it was increased.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice a reduction of \$450,000 in the training station on the Great Lakes. Does that refer to the Great Lakes Training Station at Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Outside of Chicago, yes. The gentleman will notice several other reductions if he will scrutinize the report, because of the lack of necessity for them.

Mr. DONDERO. I commend the gentleman and his committee for the carefulness with which this report has been prepared and the economies already obtained, which I am sure will be approved by the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY. There has been no attempt on the part of this committee to economize at the expense of either the Navy or the United States or the possibility of being able to do a lot of things which we may have to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has consumed 45 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss a recapitulation of H. R. 3493, the Navy Department appropriation bill, I wish to express my compliments to the chairman of the committee for the courteous manner in which he conducted the hearings. While, of course, there have been times when we have not been in mutual agreement on all the problems that were before us, yet I can assure you that the Committee has resolved those problems in a very amiable manner.

When we appeared before you with the last regular appropriation bill for the Navy we had with us as our clerk and advisor, Mr. Jack McFall, who had served the Committee long and faithfully. While he has gone to a very splendid post

with the State Department and while he has been succeeded by a very splendid young gentleman, we certainly do miss Jack and his friendly attitude which we all enjoyed as we conducted the hearings. Do not, however, get the idea that I want to minimize the efforts and ability of Mr. Sprinkle, who is Mr. McFall's successor. Mr. Sprinkle has done a very remarkable job and has served members of both sides on the committee in a very splendid and gracious manner, and I am sure that we are going to enjoy working with him for quite some time, and the changes that have occurred in the past will not perhaps be so definitely indicated in the future.

Relative to the bill we have under consideration this afternoon there has been quite some discussion in the press relative to cuts being made by the Appropriations Committee in its various bills. I wish to call your attention, if I may, to the fact that this bill is consistent and has had a considerable cut. The cut operation, of course, had its origin in the Secretary's office, then in the Bureau of the Budget, and finally in the Congress. The original request from the Navy Department was for \$8,161,232,563. After the Office of the Secretary of the Navy had scrutinized the figures very carefully, in their discretion they cut the request by \$2,371,268,063, which left a balance at that time of \$5,789,964,500. Then, of course, the bill went over to the Bureau of the Budget, where those mathematically astute gentlemen proceeded to amputate another \$2,276,964,200. So the total cut that this bill had prior to its arrival in the Congress for its consideration is \$4,648,232,263.

When Navy appeared before our committee the presentation that was made by requests at that time was an amount of \$3,513,300,000 new money. The committee in its wisdom or in its conclusion made a further total cut of \$376,519,200.

There is a difference between my total and that referred to by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], which I think is due to the fact that I carried a recap of special and trust funds which I do not think he had in his statement. In the final analysis the cuts that have been made and which have been referred to in detail by the chairman may have some repercussions that will not be acceptable.

I went along with the committee in the cuts that were presented to the committee as a whole and I intend to go along with them on the floor of the House, reserving, however, my right, if the Navy feels they are injured to the extent that it is going to be damaging and they can make their case before the Senate in more clarified effect than they may have had the opportunity to do it before our committee, to concur with whatever the Senate may increase the bill, if it meets with my approval.

I feel this way about appropriations for our military forces. I have been known ever since I became a member of this committee as a big Navy man and so far I am suffering no regrets for that attitude. While I was over in Europe I had an opportunity to observe the considerable operations of a foreign power

that today dominates Europe to a very large degree. Their ambition to extend their sphere of influence was very definitely indicated. How far that extension will ultimately reach nobody knows. I have watched with a great deal of interest the tactics that have been applied in conferences held by the respective committees representing the United States and other governments in international affairs, and for some reason I have not been able to diagnose at the moment, why this Nation to whom I originally referred continues to strenuously object to the expedition of a legitimate understanding of international problems. To me, if nations are seriously concerned in endeavoring to avert a repetition of World War II, there is no legitimate or logical reason why they cannot sit down around a conference table and reach a more expeditious consideration and result than appears to have taken place or have been effected as of this date. Feeling that there is an expansion ambition very definitely being exercised by Russia, in my opinion, it is within the realm of stupidity for this Nation to decrease its military strength beyond the point of requirements to meet any eventuality that may ultimately develop. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, I am reserving my right, to see what occurs when the Navy has finally analyzed the cuts that have been made in this bill and to make further justification of its position.

Of course we did not cut anything out of the transferred funds, \$50,000,000 taken from the clothing and small stores fund to be applied on subsistence of the Navy, another transfer of \$50,000,000 from the naval stock fund which goes to the maintenance of ships, another \$50,000,000 from the Navy stock fund to go to maintenance of supplies. There was a replacement of \$14,280,000 that was not disturbed at all and, as stated by the chairman of our committee, the contractual authority for purchase of aircraft, \$170,000,000, was not disturbed.

So, it resolves itself to a question of whether it can be ultimately determined what the effectiveness of the cuts will be upon the Navy and its personnel. Insofar as my personal attitude is concerned, I do not intend to offer any amendment to the bill before you for consideration, but I do feel that it is only within keeping that we should keep ourselves in an open-minded attitude, so if we find that something has occurred in the decreases made in this bill that is detrimental to an adequate naval force, that we can then adjust it when it goes over to the other body.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee spent some 6 or 7 weeks hearing witnesses and generally considering this bill. No time was lost on partisanship. Your committee takes great pride in the harmony that prevails.

By and large, the objectives of the bill are all right. However, the Republican majority cut several bureaus too deeply. These items are: First, pay and subsistence of Navy personnel, which was cut approximately \$94,171,000 or about

7 percent; second, pay of Marine Corps was cut \$20,000,000; third, maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics was cut about \$55,500,000, leaving \$474,000,000; fourth, maintenance of the Bureau of Ships, about \$74,750,000, leaving for expenditure in 1948, \$300,000,000; and fifth, Bureau of Ordnance was cut \$28,000,000 leaving for expenditure for 1948, \$180,000,000. My disagreement is purely one of degree.

During these troubled times, I doubt the wisdom of these substantial cuts. Maybe 12 months hence, after world conditions are clarified, these cuts can be substantiated by even going deeper. But, at this particular time, I do not approve of the chances we are taking.

The budget estimates under "Pay and subsistence" were supposed to be based upon an enlisted strength of the Navy of 425,000 men and 40,000 officers. The Budget cut "Pay and subsistence" \$32,000,000 and your committee reduced the estimate another \$94,171,000, thus making a total cut in "Pay and subsistence" of \$126,171,000. I am advised by the Navy Department that this sum will reduce the average enlisted strength of the Navy during fiscal 1948 from 425,000 men to 355,000; that 355,000 men is entirely insufficient to carry out the Navy operating force plan.

In my humble judgment, 425,000 enlisted men is small enough to man our fleet for the next 12 months—or at least until permanent peace is assured. A Navy of 471,000 officers and men during the fiscal 1948 is a tremendous come-down from 3,200,000 officers and men in the fiscal year 1946.

If we are to maintain an active fleet of 267 combat vessels; 31 in reduced commission status and 631 in reserve, along with our supporting shore establishments, plus Navy Aviation, then 471,000 officers and men is the bare minimum.

Yet, under this bill, we cut pay and subsistence by \$126,171,000, which automatically cuts personnel by at least 70,000 men. The most effective way to reduce the size of the Navy is to reduce the funds to feed and pay the men. Without these funds, the men must be discharged.

Pay of the Marine Corps, as approved by budget, provides for 7,500 officers and 90,000 enlisted men. But the committee reduced this item \$20,000,000. In doing so, we cut down the average strength of the Marine Corps to 6,500 officers and 79,000 enlisted men, which is too great a cut.

The committee has supplied the Bureau of Aeronautics funds for the purchase, during fiscal 1948, of 579 new airplanes at a total cost of \$260,000,000. Thirty-six percent are new type planes; the remainder improvements on old types. That amount was the budget estimate. I am not sure that the budget was correct in its estimate. If it was, the Navy Department was wrong because it asked for funds to purchase 1,276 planes.

I must confess though that it is quite arguable whether it is wise to spend money now to buy new planes, which in all probability will be obsolete 5 years from now. Who knows, however, whether we will be called upon to fight six

months from now, or 12 months, or never. If challenged, we must fight with planes we have developed and not with those that will be developed 5 years hence. That was the costly position we were in in 1941.

During fiscal year 1948, we will operate 6,130 planes for the regular Navy and Marine Corps. During the year, 2,115 of these will be junked due to crashes, old age and attrition. In other words, attrition gets 34½ percent of the number operated per year. In addition to these 6,130 planes, we have in reserve a pool of 3,800 planes. Since we are buying only 538 new planes in fiscal 1948, our reserve pool of 3,800 will be exhausted in the next 3 years.

It should be pointed out that England's air force today is stronger than ours. Also, it should be emphasized and reemphasized that the best opinion in this country is that Russia has a production capacity of planes in the neighborhood of 75,000 a year, which is several times our present capacity. That raises the all important question: What shall we do with our airplane industry? Shall we let it die or shall we support it with the purchase of new planes? If we let it die, we will be in the position that we were in 1941, namely, almost helpless. If we support it to some degree of efficiency, the taxpayers must be prepared to spend in excess of a billion dollars a year. This is for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

It should be pointed out in unmistakable terms that our first line of defense is not our battleships—with the exception of our aircraft carriers—nor is it our infantry, but our airplanes.

The cut of \$55,500,000 in the Bureau of Aeronautics comes in the maintenance of our aviation stations, in the upkeep of our aircraft and fuel.

The Bureau of Aeronautics today has only 42 active fields in the United States. These ring the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific coasts. It has 21 for Reserve training and 24 outside the United States. These stations must be adequately maintained, and it costs money to do that job. The investment in these installations runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is poor business to let them go to pot.

Perhaps \$20,000,000 could be saved by completely winding up the Naval Air Transport Service. By cutting out this item, no serious function of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics would be disturbed. We all know that far too much money is spent on travel in the Navy. Three to five million dollars could also be saved this Bureau by winding up blimp activities lock, stock, and barrel. They are as out of date in this world of increasing speed as the model T Ford.

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Ships was \$374,750,000. This amount was reduced \$74,750,000 by the committee. This cut is too deep because these funds are used, first, to maintain and operate the active fleet, with alteration to those vessels, at an estimated cost for 1948 of \$154,000,000; second, to maintain 15 shipyards, where its repair work is done, and to maintain 14 manufacturing plants in stand-by condition. These are

less than 8 percent of the total construction during the war; third, to maintain the inactive fleet, which is berthed at 16 different places; fourth, scientific investigation and research. It should be borne in mind that under the heading "Maintenance of Shore Stations," these funds pay for maintenance and operation of shore radio, radar, and sonar stations, which number about 2,500.

It requires manpower to alter, repair, and maintain an operating fleet. Likewise it requires a large amount of manpower to berth our huge inactive fleet and to give it the barest minimum care and attention. It takes manpower to maintain the shipyards themselves. Most of this work necessarily is done by H-B and per diem employees. Their pay is one of the big items in the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships. If we cut their pay, we cut off the work they perform. When their work is not done, the active and inactive fleets and our shipyards deteriorate in proportion. There is no money in this bill for a new ship construction program. However, there are a few million dollars included to build several new type submarines.

What I have said about the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships can also be said with equal accuracy as to the maintenance of the Bureau of Ordnance. Today we have an investment in the Bureau of Ordnance in the form of ammunition, armament, and plant facilities approximating \$5,000,200,000. The Bureau was granted \$180,000,000, which was a reduction of \$28,000,000 below the budget. With the funds granted, it must necessarily carry on its work of, first, research and development of improved ordnance; second, maintenance and upkeep of ordnance equipment afloat and ashore. The cost of our present supply of ammunition is three and one-half billion dollars and of guns and armaments, one and a half billion; third, maintenance and operation of the ordnance shore establishments; and fourth, production and procurement of new ordnance not required for new ships.

For new ordnance which does not come under the heading of "AAA," namely, ordnance for new ships, the Bureau requested the sum of \$62,000,000; for research and development, \$50,000,000; for maintenance of its shore installations and ordnance stores, \$70,000,000. Thus, it is readily seen that the maintenance of our investment in ordnance stores and ordnance installations is rather small. The reduction of \$28,000,000 is considerably too much.

Your committee, in two respects, did an outstanding job and used good judgment when it did not reduce the budget estimates of any of the bureaus of the Navy for scientific investigations and research. However, in my humble opinion, the budget estimates of approximately \$203,000,000 should have been increased because it is these funds that will provide the new types of Navy implements should we go to war again. It might be added that it does not require a great amount of imagination to realize that one of the most destructive implements of the next war will be manless, flying

missiles carrying atomic bombs, which will travel enormous distances and hit their targets. These implements are in their infancy, and they must be perfected.

Other nations are ahead of us now in the fields of scientific investigation and research, with the possible exception of the atomic bomb. It is accurate to state that in 1941 we were behind our enemies in the way of new implements of war. We had to borrow, beg, and procure by other means the ideas behind all of our modern implements. The only field of science in which we led was in the field of medicine. Even then, we had to get DDT from Germany.

Surely the Bureau of Aeronautics, which requested \$150,000,000 of the budget for scientific investigation and research should have been given approximately that amount. However your committee saw fit to allow the budget estimate of only \$75,000,000. In this bill we have granted the Bureau of Ordnance \$50,000,000 for scientific investigation and research. That amount should be increased to at least \$75,000,000. The Bureau today is carrying on some experiments that no doubt will prove to be revolutionary.

The other feather that should be placed in the cap of the committee is for its strong belief in the development of the Navy and Marine Corps Reserves. The budget estimates for these two items were not reduced. I think I speak the unanimous opinion of the committee in saying that we realize the backbone of the future wartime Navy and Marine Corps is the Reserve. If there is an answer to universal military training, it lies in a large Reserve with regular training periods, and equipped with modern implements.

Before closing, I must pay tribute to Fleet Admiral Nimitz and his staff and to the Chiefs of the bureaus and their staffs. Vice Adm. Earl Mills, Chief, Bureau of Ships; Vice Adm. E. L. Cockrane, Chief, Material Division; Rear Adm. H. B. Sallada, former Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics; Rear Adm. C. A. Swanson, Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; Rear Adm. J. J. Manning, Bureau of Yards and Docks; and Rear Adm. W. A. Buck, Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, have all done an outstanding job. It is no small matter to take the greatest navy on earth and shake it down to proportionate peacetime conditions in a period of 18 months. Each of these gentlemen is to be commended for the fine job he has done under very difficult circumstances. I should also like to mention Rear Adm. T. L. Sprague, who recently took over the Bureau of Naval Personnel from a great Chief, Louis B. Denfeld, and Rear Adm. A. M. Pride, who succeeded Admiral Sallada as Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. I know that each of them will do a grand job. Let me also pay tribute to that all-time great Chief of the Marine Corps, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift.

The charge is often leveled against bureaus of the Government that Communists are working with them. At no time, as far as I know, has any such charge been made against the Navy De-

partment. This is another strong commendation for these fine officers.

It should be stated as an outstanding fact that more good business practices and procedures now exist in the Navy Department than any time in its history. This accomplishment is largely due to the untiring efforts of Secretary Forrestal. His budget people, led by Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood and Mr. Wilfred J. McNeil, are continually hammering away at the job. I am confident that we will see continuous and steady improvement along these lines.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Did the committee allow the amount that the Budget did for naval aviation?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No. I am sorry. We cut the Bureau of Aeronautics for maintenance \$55,500,000. I intend to offer a correcting figure. However, we did allow the budget estimates on the purchase of new planes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the subcommittee and the committee have done a good job on this bill. I believe a study of the hearings will establish that the questions that have been raised with reference to the sufficiency of the provision of funds will be answered to the effect that the committee has provided what is necessary for the operation of the Navy.

Personally, I have not the intimate knowledge of the items of this appropriation bill that the members of the subcommittee have. As has been customary, the members of the subcommittee have gone ahead and held the hearings with such help as the staff of the committee has been able to provide, and it is primarily their bill. No one member of the subcommittee, of course, nor anyone else would be completely satisfied with it, but over all it is a very satisfactory job.

The thing that I have been impressed with in connection with our national defense is the utter lack of coordination between the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, and the operations of the Maritime Commission. In other words, the program of each of those agencies fails to dovetail in or be supplemental to the program of any of the others. Because of that we have an Army that could not fit into the military picture that the Navy would, a Navy that could not fit into the military picture that the Army would, an Air Corps that is built up on the same principles; and on top of that the Maritime Commission has allowed things to slide—and slide is all they have done. The conditions in that Commission are terrible, and there is no such thing as preserving or having prepared anything in the nature of goods or passenger transport which would enable the defense organization to function.

The administration, under President Truman has not brought about that coordination.

I wish to say at this time that, in my opinion, the interests of national defense

absolutely demand that this coordination take place and that if no bill is passed providing for that coordination through some officer, named by the President, who is in that measure given the authority to make the coordination and if that does not take place, if we are not assured that the administration will attempt it, I want to say to the Congress that the appropriations committee is going to assume that all other efforts having failed, it is necessary that the appropriations committee proceed with the operation of coordination.

I do not like the job. It means endless days and nights of strenuous work for the members of the appropriations committee but it is a responsibility of everyone connected with the Congress in view of the fact that the administration has not taken steps to bring this about to see that the job is done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, if I could make one contribution to this Congress and my country—yes, to the world—I think it would be toward an effort to insure peace. If victory at arms gave us a responsibility, it was that of enthusiastically pursuing the course of peace as zealously as we pursued victory at arms.

I am not a member of this distinguished subcommittee nor of the Appropriations Committee of the House. I do feel they have given careful consideration to the demands of the national defense of this country. I have great respect for the members of that committee. As a Member of this body charged with the responsibility of providing an army and navy, however, I must look first to the source that I consider most responsible for the defense of the country. That is not the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Chairman, nor the President of the United States; it is the Army and the Navy.

I am disappointed that this bill does not carry out the requests of the Navy. Admiral Nimitz has, time after time, said when asked what size of Navy we need in the interest of our responsibilities in this world that no man living could answer at this time. He did, however, give the size of a navy that would be needed to maintain peace and decency in the world.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is realized that from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day we spent, I believe, about \$120,000,000,000 on the Navy? From Armistice Day in 1918 until Pearl Harbor 1941, that would have averaged more than \$5,000,000,000 per year. Does anyone question the fact that if we had possessed a \$5,000,000,000 Navy each year from 1918 until Pearl Harbor, 1941, there would not have been a Pearl Harbor? Very likely, and I believe it, there would not have been the terrible, bloody, dirty war in which many men of this Congress and millions outside of this Congress fought. There would not have been 300,000 white crosses. There would not have been the great concern, now felt, as to whether or not we shall live in a peaceful world.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this Congress can support an adequate navy, dedicated to peace, as enthusiastically as it supported one dedicated to war.

It is a difficult thing to spend billions of dollars of the people's money to do this, but I would rather support a \$5,000,000,000 navy for the next 5 years—yes, a \$6,000,000,000 navy or a \$10,000,000,000 navy for the next 5 years or the next 10 years—than to lose one single American in a possible war. War is a dirty, nasty business. If there is a doubt as to the present needs of our Navy, I hope you will give the benefit of the doubt in the interest of peace in this country and of the world when we make this appropriation. I sincerely urge you to do so, for perhaps the future of mankind depends upon it. Yes; victory in arms gave us an opportunity to do a great work in the world, to insure peace and decency. I know that my people want me, and I believe that your people want you, to support the kind of navy and the kind of army that will insure the peace that was bought so dearly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this 2 minutes in order to ask the chairman and the members of the committee a couple of questions that have me a little bit puzzled. A reading of the bill and the report indicates that the over-all cut for the Navy Department is approximately 11 percent across the board. I note that on page 8, under "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," and on page 10, the amount appropriated for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, is \$300,000,000, and in addition to that amount a transfer of \$50,000,000 from the Navy stock fund.

Now, as I understand, that is a reduction of approximately 17 percent below what the Navy Department requested for Bureau of Ships maintenance and material. Then, if we turn to page 25, under "Salaries, Navy Department," we find an appropriation for the Bureau of Ships of \$5,450,000, which is a reduction below the \$7,267,500 which the Bureau of Ships requested, and which amounts to a 25-percent reduction. I cannot understand this discrepancy in figures for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, personnel; that is, salary for the Bureau of Ships, and the 11 percent over-all reduction for the entire Navy Department appropriation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. We did not try to maintain a universal percentage or a proportional cut as between the departments. I think the gentleman alluded to that.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; I alluded to that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. We did not try to do that. To be absolutely frank with the gentleman, we thought they asked too much and we cut it down.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I expected and appreciate a frank answer from the chairman, but I still cannot understand the discrepancy between an 11-

percent over-all naval reduction, a 17-percent reduction in material requests, and a 25-percent reduction in personnel request for the one bureau.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The committee considered each appropriation on its own merits without any percentage for any appropriation. It is only coincidental that the reduction turned out to be the percentages you mentioned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we now get to the point of the Navy. What I shall say will be in no respect a reflection on the splendid committee who heretofore, before today, have done a pretty good job for the Navy and for the country. I believe, however, that the presentation to the Congress of this budget to operate the Navy for the next fiscal year is not well thought out, is not well prepared, and certainly is not good for the morale of the country at this time. World conditions are such that we can ill afford to immobilize our Navy or dismantle our Navy, or immobilize our Army, and send our armed forces, both the Army and the Navy, with this component part each of the air, into the limbo of forgotten men.

I wish every Member of this Congress, certainly of the Appropriations Committee, could go over the landscape of this Nation and see what facilities the Navy possesses. I wish the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York, could go from Maine to Florida and from Washington to the Gulf of Mexico and see what the Navy possesses, see the astronomical job it has of carrying on its mission now that the peace has finally arrived. I do not believe you can tell the Navy, "Here is your money. Now, cut your garment to fit it." I do not believe, in view of world conditions, that we can afford to make such a drastic reduction at this time.

We heard from the press today the results of the Security Council of the United Nations up in New York, where Gromyko told us point blank that Russia would not let us or anybody else find out what is going on behind the iron curtain. A word to the wise is sufficient. We ought to know that we can ill afford to cast to the four winds every straw in the wind which tells us we cannot now send our Navy to the bottom of the briny deep.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I will be delighted to yield to my dear friend from St. Louis, who has always been a great friend of the Navy.

Mr. PLOESER. I would hate to think that I am getting the impression from my distinguished friend, whom I admire so much and who is a practical Navy man from South Carolina, I would just hate to think that I am getting the impression or this House is getting the impression or, what is much more dangerous, the Nation is getting the impression that this bill immobilizes the United States Navy, or that we made a drastic reduction of just a lump sum. I can assure the gentleman that such is not the case.

Mr. RIVERS. I will say this to the gentleman: I would not under any condition reflect on the patriotism of my friend from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I did not mean that anything my friend said reflected on anyone's patriotism, but I want him to be factual in this thing.

Mr. RIVERS. I want this House to understand and I do not believe that the Appropriations Committee of the House or any committee of the House can tell the Nation today that the Navy can live up to a 10, 11, 15, or any arbitrary percent of reductions, in view of world conditions.

For instance, in 1938 this Congress would not permit the fortification of Guam. I did not question the patriotism of the Congress, but it turned out to be disastrous. This bill greatly curtails the Navy. I think the members of the Committee on Appropriations should go to these Navy yards and see the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of ships tied up going to wrack and ruin without any program at this time.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PLOESER. When you say that we tied up hundreds of ships without any program, you are indicting the management of the United States Navy and not the Congress.

We provided for the laying up of the ships, and we gave them everything they requested in order to do it.

Mr. RIVERS. The Congress last year set up our fleet, and when you do not provide for maintenance and do not give them the money to carry on the Reserve programs and carry on the air operation of the Navy, they cannot properly operate. We do not have sufficient money in this bill to properly operate the air arm of the Navy.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PLOESER. You have made some statements upon which I am compelled to comment.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sorry.

Mr. PLOESER. We allowed a sufficient amount of money for the reserve program. The committee last year increased the budget request for the reserve program. This committee this year gave them every nickel they asked for, the bill confirms this fact. We must not go on assumptions here, but we must go according to the facts.

Mr. RIVERS. What is going to happen to the NROTC program under this bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will answer that question by saying that we appropriated on the basis of what they were able to accomplish last year 12 times what they expended and we are ready if they show us to have been error with regard to those that I talked about this afternoon to accept a reasonable amendment to make it possible for every one of the 3,000 boys in this country who are qualified for that program to be made a part of it.

Mr. RIVERS. What is going to be a reasonable amendment, may I ask my chairman?

Mr. PLUMLEY. It would have to be a reasonable project, if you please.

Mr. RIVERS. The chairman said a while ago, and I want to say a word about it, that they thought it was too top heavy and that is why they were cut down, and if that is not arbitrary, I do not know what is.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman ought to yield to me because he has misquoted me.

Mr. RIVERS. I beg your pardon if I have.

Mr. PLUMLEY. You have.

Mr. RIVERS. Perhaps I misunderstood you.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Answering the gentleman's question a while ago as to the status of our laid-up ships and with reference to the maintenance of the Bureau of Ships, its yards, its reserve fleet, and its active fleet, and so forth, I must state that the figure we have recommended for the consideration and approval of the House is \$74,500,000 less than the budget granted and some three times less than the Bureau of Ships requested of the budget. Is that clear?

Mr. RIVERS. I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not this is another one of these appropriation bills where the reduction was set before the hearings were held.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Well, the gentleman may be familiar with that modus operandi, but I never heard about it before. What are you talking about?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I was just wondering whether or not there was any instruction from the committee chairman, that is, the chairman of the full committee, to make any certain percentage of reduction before the beginning of the hearings.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The chairman of the full committee is right here. He will tell you whether he had any conference with me at any time with respect to the percentage of reduction or with reference to what action my committee might take. I will leave it to him.

I want to tell you something you should bear in mind, that this was a unanimous report of the subcommittee and a unanimous report of the Appropriations Committee. Everybody present voted for it. Now, you can kick and buck and haul as much as you want to, but you are sunk.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be nearly so sunk as is the United States Navy, if we do not carry on a more orderly program in these chaotic times and conditions.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], asked some questions that are logical and reasonable. Nobody in this House can answer those questions. The fact remains clear to all of us, I do not know what we are doing to the

United States Navy at this time under this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. I have sat on the Naval Affairs Committee for 6 years while we built up this Navy. I do not think now is the time to dismantle the United States Navy. The onus will be on those who are responsible for this. Now, let us get together and reestablish some of these cuts. The gentleman has said he will entertain some reasonable amendments. I am going to try to present one or two, and I hope they will be accepted. I do not question the sincerity or patriotism of my esteemed friend from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]; but I am astounded at this bill coming in here like this. I am not the only one that cannot understand it. The American people cannot understand it. We have got time before the clock strikes this afternoon to do the right thing. Let us get together and do it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I am exceedingly disappointed that the gentleman does not understand the bill, but that does not mean that the subcommittee does not understand it. We thought we did, or we would not have brought it out here. But we shall endeavor, during the course of the afternoon, to make it clear so that my distinguished friend will understand it.

Mr. RIVERS. Now, my friend does not mean to be facetious, I am sure.

Mr. PLOESER. No. I am quite serious. I have a great regard for the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Well, there is no other Member I admire more than I do the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I want to refer to the remarks made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], as to this being the unanimous action on the part of the subcommittee. I understand it was unanimous as to objectivity, but not as to the amount involved.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to know what my distinguished friend from Illinois means by "objectivity." I am a humble man from Missouri, and I do not understand all these big words.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. If the gentleman had attended school in Illinois he might have understood it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I have no alternative.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes in order that he may yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], not being a member of the Ap-

appropriations Committee, he seems to know more about the workings of that committee than the members themselves. That is unusual, but then we will assume that he knows. If the gentleman will study this bill and the budget requests, he will find there has not been a percentage cut made in this bill. Naturally, all amounts, as they apply in relation to other amounts, are in a percentage, but there has been no flat percentage cut across the board. We have tried to apply these cuts as we thought they would fit. The gentleman well knows, if he is so familiar with the proceedings of the Appropriations Committee, that there was no lump sum within which we had to come, unless by a reading of the hearings we may assume that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] set a lump sum when he said we could safely cut this budget \$500,000,000. We did not. We cut it \$377,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. I am not going to make any statement that this bill fulfills campaign promises. I would not subscribe to that statement; but I will say that at this time I do not believe we can afford to present a bill like this to Congress and expect that it will pass in this form. I think that if reasonable amendments to serve specific bureaus in the Navy Department are not adopted providing increases—and I say this seriously to the committee—if these increases are not made and world conditions develop, as I hope they will not, the onus will be on us in this Congress, and I do not believe we can explain it to the American people—not in the light of what is transpiring today in Europe and beyond the iron curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side, either. I suggest that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay and allowances: Officers, active duty, no part of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights, by more than 85 officers above the rank of captain nor by nonflying officers or observers at rates in excess of those prescribed by law for the Army, which shall be the legal maximum rates as to such nonflying officers or observers; midshipmen; officers, retired, inactive; enlisted personnel, active, including cash prizes for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, communication, and engineering competition; enlisted men, retired, inactive; men of the Fleet Reserve, inactive; nurses, female, active; nurses, female, retired, inactive; 6 months' death gratuity, officers, nurses, and enlisted personnel; cash allowances for uniforms for officers; clothing furnished annually to enlisted personnel and issued in kind to members of the Navy Nurse Corps or cash in lieu thereof; civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed \$30 per person to enlisted personnel given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude; reimbursement as authorized by the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277), to persons in the naval service, for personal property lost, destroyed, or damaged; purchase of medals,

crosses, bars, emblems, and other insignia; miscellaneous items, including interest on deposits by enlisted personnel; losses in the accounts of Navy and Marine Corps officers certified under the act of July 11, 1919 (31 U. S. C. 105), and the act of June 10, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 104), and payments in settlement of claims under the act of January 2, 1942 (31 U. S. C. 224d); commuted rations; money allowances for subsistence and quarters of enlisted personnel when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind, and for enlisted personnel absent from messes on temporary duty not involving travel (during which time all other subsistence shall be stopped): *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department; total, pay and allowances, \$1,153,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

Page 13, line 9, strike out "\$1,153,000,000" and insert "\$1,279,171,000."

Page 13, line 14, strike out "\$1,200,000,000," and insert "\$1,326,171,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for one specific purpose, to restore to the Navy its uniformed personnel to 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers as an average throughout the fiscal year 1948. It merely adds \$126,171,000. The Bureau of Personnel or the Budget apparently made some mistake. Whether it was the Bureau of Personnel or the Budget I do not know. The Bureau of Personnel says it was the Budget. The Budget attempted to allow them enough money, namely, \$1,290,000,000 to support the manpower of 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers through an average of the year, but the Budget made an error by striking out \$32,000,000 too much. Then our committee came along and reduced the budget figure by \$94,197,000 making a total cut of \$126,171,000. The Navy Department says if the figure stands as the committee has written it without this addition of \$126,171,000, instead of having an average figure of 425,000 men throughout the fiscal year they will only have 355,000, a reduction of 70,000 men.

Frankly, I do not think the committee intended to cut that severely and certainly I do not think, I hope not anyway, that it is the desire and the wish of the House to reduce the strength of the Navy to that extent. If we do that we are going to change the entire operating force plan of the Navy. If my memory serves me correctly, it was only about a year or a year and a half ago when the Navy legislative committee, and this House backed it up almost unanimously, set as a peacetime figure a Navy of an average strength of 500,000. Now we are

reducing it by these appropriation figures around 95,000, a reduction of 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will restore this fund because if there ever was a time not to be drastic in your cuts now is the time to act with some reason. When you go to cutting off the pay and the food, and that is what this item does, you are reducing the strength of the Navy, because if you cannot pay the men and cannot feed them the Navy will have to discharge them. I hope the committee will restore this cut and place the strength of the Navy up where it belongs. Four hundred and twenty-five thousand men, in my humble judgment, is the bare minimum that we ought to have at this time.

Mr. FLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read to the Committee some of the testimony on this very point. I am sure the gentleman from Texas is in agreement with the committee still insofar as it was not our intention to make any drastic, radical reduction in the size of the naval force. I do not recall any of these figures being presented to the subcommittee by the gentleman, which leads me to believe that they came into his possession at a very recent hour.

Mr. Chairman, I read from page 570 of the hearings on this very point:

Mr. JOHNSON. A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay" is from \$32,000,000 to \$34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations to meet the pay for 425,000 men in the Navy and 46,000 officers in the Navy. Is that correct? Captain DARDEN. That is correct.

Up to that point the gentleman's statement is accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you care to make any explanation in regard to it?

Captain DARDEN. That simply means that we will maintain the 425,000 enlisted and 46,000 officers within amounts herein asked for.

The Secretary of the Navy has very few controls over what makes up the expenditures for pay. The main one is promotions and rank and rating structure, and in the officers' savings, the administrative actions we will probably have to take to keep within this lesser amount will be rank reversions.

There is another way we can save some money to get within the total herein requested, and that is by taking on additional ensigns from the contract students that will be coming out between now and June 30.

And he goes on and made a later statement in which he says:

As a matter of fact, we are going to be at least 3,000 to 4,000 officers short of the figure which we have stated.

So, that is a frank admission that they not only could fit within the budget set forth, which the gentleman and he says was \$32,000,000 short, but that they do not even anticipate meeting their officer strength as set by their own plan schedule.

When this committee considered what amounts to a 7 percent pay reduction we also had in mind the fact that there are probably too many men of high rank

in the Navy, and there might be a considerable program of reversion to pre-war rank—and that does not go alone for the Navy; that statement may be said for all military forces. There is an inclination to keep high rank, using as many men as possible. So, we have not impaired the Navy.

Now, there is something else that must be taken into consideration. According to these figures, we would have had an enlisted men's strength in the original Budget Bureau of 425,000 men and 46,000 officers; 227,333 of these enlisted men are to serve the fleet and 17,846 officers are to serve the fleet. That means that under their present figures we were to have afloat, or in the immediate fleet, 245,179 men and, mind you, ashore 225,821 men. And, except for that rule, which applies to all governmental departments, that you have to justify the budget or be subject to something from above, there is not a Navy man that will tell you that you have to have a shore establishment of 225,000 men in this day to support a fleet of 245,000 men. The subcommittee reduction will not keep one ship ashore, but rather it will make more efficient the streamlining of these operations in relation to the shore establishment and the active fleet.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri will agree that it was stated in the committee that the budget estimate was \$32,000,000 too low to support the estimate of 425,000 enlisted men?

Mr. PLOESER. I read that statement from the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I just wanted to clarify our thinking. All right. The gentleman agrees with me. Now, I wonder if the gentleman will read the letter that was sent from Admiral Nimitz' office this morning to the chairman of the subcommittee and, I am also advised, to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have received no letter from Admiral Nimitz; neither have I received any letter from the Secretary of the Navy, although I have seen copies of that letter addressed to other members of this subcommittee, which is confidential, and not addressed to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I knew if the gentleman had it he would read it. I am just wondering if whoever has that letter will answer this question: Does it state in there that the figures granted by the subcommittee will reduce the strength of the enlisted personnel of the Navy by 70,000, which means that we will have during 1948 an average figure not of 425,000 but of 355,000?

Mr. TABER. After a fashion it does. On the other hand, the whole picture of the hearings and the letter indicate that

they are not telling the same story in the letter that they told in the hearings. That is something it is very difficult for any committee to deal with. They told us in the hearings they could carry 425,000 men with the budget estimate. On the other hand, they told us they were going to have 37,000 who would run out of work the 1st of January. You have a right to assume when these departments come before you and tell you a story that they are telling the truth.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I do not think there is a harder worker in this House than my distinguished friend from New York, for whom I have a deep love and affection, and I agree with him far more times than I disagree with him, but I wonder if, instead of giving us his conclusions about the letter, he will read the letter and tell us whether or not Operations flatly stated in that letter that this sum of money will reduce their enlisted personnel of the Navy for 1948 to 355,000 men.

Mr. TABER. The letter tells a different story than was told the committee in the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think the letter ought to speak for itself. Does not the gentleman think we ought to let Admiral Nimitz and his staff figure out the personnel needs? After all, they are going to spend the money.

Mr. TABER. This letter is not from Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No; it is from Admiral Sherman. He is deputy to Admiral Nimitz.

Mr. TABER. No; it is not.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Who is it from, then?

Mr. TABER. It is from the Secretary. Frankly, it is marked "confidential." I do not know whether or not I ought to go on the floor and read it. I do not know what is confidential about it, because very evidently the whole thing was supplied to the gentleman from Texas in an unrestrained manner so that he had the advantage over the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. It was your fault, then, if I had the advantage over the committee. You had the letter. You should have let them read it.

Mr. TABER. After I received the letter I called his attention to the testimony that was given by the representatives of the Bureau of Personnel, and he had no satisfactory explanation to offer.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Did the Secretary of the Navy ask you to be good enough to restore those cuts?

Mr. TABER. Yes. There is no question about that. But when they do not dispute the testimony they have already given and do not satisfactorily explain why they are telling a different story now than they did then, I cannot go along with them.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentleman did not hear the testimony and he knows he did not. He is giving his own conclusion. Of course they cannot explain it to his satisfaction.

Mr. TABER. I have read the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Let me read from the hearings:

Mr. JOHNSON. A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay" is from \$32,000,000 to \$34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations—

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe that figure? Is the gentleman questioning that figure now? Does he believe it?

Mr. TABER. When I finish reading I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe they are \$34,000,000 short or does he disbelieve it?

Mr. TABER. I am going to read it, and the gentleman will see that this captain who was testifying admitted that it was not \$34,000,000 short. I am wondering which side of the dilemma the gentleman is on.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Right down the middle.

Mr. TABER. Is he going to take the word of the Secretary or the admission of this man?

A statement has been made that this appropriation, under "Pay," is from \$32,000,000 to \$34,000,000 short under the Bureau of the Budget, of computations to meet the pay for 425,000 men in the Navy and 46,000 officers in the Navy. Is that correct?

Captain DARDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would you care to make any explanation in regard to it?

Captain DARDEN. That simply means that we will maintain the 425,000 enlisted and 46,000 officers within amounts herein asked for.

That means it was not short a penny because they could maintain the number of men they were asking for on the money that was provided in the estimates and that it was not short thirty-two to thirty-four million dollars. So that proves absolutely the whole picture was not presented to us in the open and was not fairly presented to the committee.

When you get a story one way one time and another way another time, you almost make up your mind that you want to go along and use your own judgment.

If the gentlemen would like to have a little more about the whole situation, the gentleman from Missouri has very clearly demonstrated that there was not any shortage that would arise from this picture. They only asked for 425,000 enlisted men and 46,000 officers. Right in the hearings they say they are not going to be able to get but 42,000 officers. That is on page 471. In addition, we know that the Committee on Armed Services is trying to get the officers of the Navy into a proper balance in rank as well as the officers of the Army. They are doing a job and trying to get the whole thing straightened out so that we may have an efficient Army and an efficient Navy without so much cost.

But why should we try to prevent that process from being worked out? Furthermore, the Navy will have 37,000 men who will be engaged in this mothball job of laying up ships, which they tell us will be finished the 1st of January, which

means that we can cut out half of them on their own say so.

Reducing the personnel of the shore stations a little bit will allow for every dollar of the less than 7 percent reduction that this committee has provided.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman, because to me it is rather important so far as I am personally concerned: Was the letter the gentleman referred to in response to an interrogation he sent to the Navy or was it one that was written up generally?

Mr. TABER. It was a letter delivered to me when I came to the committee about 5:30 last evening.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was purely a letter to you as an individual?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was not intended for the subcommittee to have access to any of the letter?

Mr. TABER. It was not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories, including expansions of and facilities in public or private plants, \$90,000,000; for replacement of navigational and radio equipment for aircraft in service, aerological, photographic, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, \$18,000,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft, aircraft factory, air stations, testing laboratories, fleet and all other aviation activities, technical books and periodicals for use in the Bureau of Aeronautics and field, outfits for aviation messes, the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, and for contribution to the support of schools as authorized by section 13 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 604), \$291,000,000; for continuing experiments, development, and research on all types of aircraft, \$75,000,000; in all, \$474,000,000, of which amount \$90,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds appropriated for "Aviation, Navy," fiscal year 1945, shall continue available during the fiscal year 1948 for the liquidation of contractual obligations for aircraft and aircraft equipment procurement incurred during the fiscal year 1945: *Provided further*, That in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, contract for new construction, procurement and equipment of aircraft, including spare parts and accessories therefor, in an amount not in excess of \$170,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

On page 18, line 17, strike out "\$291,000,000" and insert "\$345,500,000."

And on line 19, page 18, strike out "\$474,000,000" and insert "\$526,500,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in favor of maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The funds for Aeronautics in the Naval Department is divided into two large subheads. One is for the purchase

of new airplanes, with which this amendment has nothing to do. The other is for the maintenance of the installations themselves, and the maintenance and operation of the planes and the purchase of fuel.

The Bureau of the Budget granted \$345,000,000 for this purpose. Our committee cut it \$55,500,000. It should be pointed out that the Bureau asked the Budget for considerably more than \$345,000,000. Then, in addition to that, the committee cut that sum by \$55,500,000.

Now, let us see how the Bureau will spend that money. During fiscal 1948 the Regular Navy and Marine Corps will operate about 6,000 planes. In addition to that, the Reserve of the Navy and the Marine Corps will operate an additional 2,000 planes. The committee has given the Bureau of Personnel every dime it asked for, for reserve recruiting. Thousands of aviators will train with this money in the Reserve, as well as the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. In addition to that we must maintain those 8,000 planes, keep them in running order, and buy fuel. In addition to that, we have 44 air stations in the United States, 22 beyond continental United States in our islands, and then we have 21 in more or less stand-by condition, used every now and then, under a small amount of maintenance for the Reserve. It is inconsistent to give the Reserve all the money they want with which to train, on the one hand, and then on the other hand deny them the planes and the stations and the fuel with which to operate the planes. We ought to restore this \$55,000,000 cut.

I want to point out to you, when it is all said and done, the front line of the defense of our country is not the infantry or our battleships, but it is the airplanes and the aircraft carriers that carry them.

Mr. Chairman, we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish to let all these planes and these stations simply go to pot because we do not give the Bureau of Aeronautics sufficient money adequately to maintain them. Two, three, or four years from now when world conditions stabilize maybe we can reduce this amount substantially, but I for one do not want to take the chance for the next 12 months, because I do not know what is going to happen and I doubt if you do.

I ask the Members to consider this amendment. I think it has merit.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As far as the last statement made by the gentleman from Texas is concerned, I am in hearty accord with him. Nobody knows what is going to happen, but every statement that he has made in substance was made before the committee or is to be found in the justifications. After we had gone all over these hearings we determined that the amount we have brought in as a necessary appropriation was a satisfactory amount and did not do the damage or restrict the Navy to any extent such as might be imagined by what the gentleman from Texas has had to say. In all fairness to the committee, and he is a fair-minded fighter, he will say that he heard all these things.

On my book he is not recorded as at the time having objected to what the committee did.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to let the membership understand what has happened in regard to some of the people who have had to do with making budgets, besides the Congress. The President in his stop order last year affected Navy aviation to this extent: He ordered them to stop spending \$44,449,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1945 appropriation. He ordered them to stop spending \$33,558,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1946 appropriation; and then he ordered them to stop spending \$51,165,000 of their funds which were left over from the 1947 appropriation, a total of \$129,172,000. The thing that rather amuses me is that the first place for the complaint of the gentleman from Texas is the White House, not the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While the gentleman's statement is correct as to the amount of money frozen, the gentleman will admit, I am sure, that the committee took care of all the unexpended balance in the frozen category.

Mr. PLOESER. Part of it was rescinded and \$26,000,000, which is in the total I have talked about is left over creditable to the Navy, expendable in the fiscal year 1948. So the figures the gentleman from Texas has been talking about are \$26,000,000 in error, because I failed to hear him mention that the Navy still has that \$26,000,000 in their left pants' pocket.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But the gentleman will admit, of course, it is practically the amount that we did consume within our committee which was in the frozen category and left there by the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. That is substantially right.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I believe the figures the gentleman read are for the purchase of new airplanes which were under the basis of a continuing appropriation.

The amendment I offered goes to maintenance, not to the purchase of new planes.

Mr. PLOESER. But the gentleman will admit that of the \$170,000,000 in contractual authorization requested for new planes this committee left every dollar.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is correct. I have no fault with that.

Mr. PLOESER. And the gentleman will further recall that these arguments that are now being presented were not presented before. At the time the bill was marked up my memorandum shows this was a unanimous agreement on this section of the bill.

I just do not understand how through a belated nightmare we can come in here this afternoon and suddenly discover a new set of figures. The gentleman from Texas is one of the keenest analysts on the Appropriations Committee. Why, he is so keen in his observations that I am one of his greatest admirers. Before we had finished marking up the bill he made this statement, on page 1193, to Captain Beardsley and Admiral Hopwood:

Well, we can reduce this budget by a half billion dollars and give you every dime you need.

Now, we have only reduced it by \$377,000,000. If the gentleman is going to keep restoring these cuts, we will not have that reduction. The thing the gentleman should be talking about is where we can apply the extra \$123,000,000 cut that he speaks of as reflected in the hearings instead of increasing these items.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We are talking about the maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics. Throwing up all of this other dust does not refer to the item under discussion. The figures the gentleman read is a continuing appropriation, not for maintenance of the Bureau of Aeronautics but for the purchase of new planes. This amendment I have offered does not touch that.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman will concede if there is anything we need in aeronautics, it is new planes. Every day the speed of these planes goes up. Present planes become obsolete with startling rapidity.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The funds are not transferable from one division to the other. Does not the gentleman think he could go along with this amendment and give them a little bit more money?

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman is asking me pointedly, the answer is "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Ordinance for new construction: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the construction and procurement of armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels provided for in the appropriation "Construction of ships," including tools and equipment in public and private plants for the production of armor, armament, and ammunition for said vessels, \$4,580,000, to be transferred from the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition," to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation on the availability of the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" for construction of new vessels shall not be applicable to this appropriation nor the appropriation "Construction of ships."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to occupy the rather unique position of being a member of this Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Army Appropriations as well. It has been a great experience for me. It has been, in fact, a valuable education. It has been the greatest pleasure to work with these older members of the Navy Subcommittee on Appropriations, for they have a storehouse of knowledge of the Navy that any man in or out of the Navy would envy.

The confidence of this House in this subcommittee is well merited. Their work throughout the war and the 2 years which have followed since the shooting has ceased and the work on this particular bill warrants your continued confidence in not only their patriotism, in not only their loyalty, but their judgment of things relating to the Navy. Many times I felt somewhat helpless as these millions and hundreds of millions and billions of dollars were juggled around. I can recall one occasion when one of the admirals referred to "this minor sum of \$39,000,000." To me that was not a small figure, but a large one, indeed. As we have completed the hearings of both the Army and the Navy Subcommittees on Appropriations, there are a few places where it would seem that there is as yet some duplication in the work in research, particularly as it relates to aviation and to guided missiles. But, we have been assured in both committees that the Joint Research and Development Board is working now, seeking in every way possible to cut out any duplication in research by either of these Departments of our Government, and they assure us that by the end of the year many duplications will be eliminated and that they will be in a position, working back and forth, to avoid duplications in the future. Duplication in use of airfields, hospitals, and other installations can be profitably studied.

Another thing that struck me as more than passing strange was the number of times that officers of the Navy came before us and talked about this item or that item as being super secret and as hush-hush. We could not talk to anyone about it at all, only to pick up the paper a week or so later and find those things given full and complete publicity as a result of hearings, possibly before another committee of the House or, as we did upon one occasion, after we had had a lot of hush-hush, pick up one of the editions of the United States News and learn more in one page of concise print about what the postwar Navy was going to be than we had learned in weeks of hearings.

Those things I cannot quite understand. Of course, throughout all of the hearings we were concerned about what the future was to hold for us. We asked all of the men that we thought could give us a logical answer what the future held,

particularly as related to the next year or the next 3 or 4 years. In no instance was there ever any indication that we faced any immediate emergency of any kind. In many of these discussions Russia or some other nation, was referred to. There is no question but what this appropriation gives the United States the greatest Navy in the world; a two-ocean Navy which many of us have wanted for so many years, a well-balanced Navy, a Navy that can carry on its functions as gloriously in the peace years as it did in the war years. They have done a splendid job. We expect them to continue to do a splendid job. They will not fail us.

The next one below us is that of England, which of course is not the navy it once was. As far as Russia is concerned, it never had a navy of any considerable size, and the larger size of the navy it now has is due, to no small degree, to the Navy ships we furnished under lend-lease, as shown by the following letter, containing a table of the Navy vessels which were delivered to Russia, some of them after VJ-day:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 30, 1947.

The Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: As requested in your letter of April 17, 1947, the following is a list, by type, of ships, boats, barges, and/or floating drydocks of the Navy transferred to the U. S. S. R. together with inclusive dates on which transfer was made:

Type	Number	Dates
AG (river tugs).....	15	Aug. 21, 1944, through Apr. 11, 1945.
AM (mine sweepers)....	34	June 25, 1943, through Aug. 17, 1945.
LCIL (landing craft, infantry).....	30	June 10, 1945, through July 20, 1945.
PF (frigate).....	28	July 13, 1945, through Sept. 4, 1945.
SC (submarine chasers, 11-foot).....	78	July 13, 1943, through Sept. 2, 1945.
BPT (motor torpedo boat).....	8	Feb. 8, 1944, through Feb. 16, 1945.
LCT (landing craft, tank).....	17	Apr. 15, 1945, through May 26, 1945.
PT (motor torpedo boat).....	194	Feb. 15, 1943, through Aug. 30, 1945.
YMA (motor mine sweepers).....	43	Mar. 31, 1945, through Sept. 2, 1945.
YR (floating work-shops).....	4	June 19, 1945, through July 29, 1945.
PTC (submarine chasers).....	26	Dec. 8, 1943, through Aug. 13, 1944.
LCM (3) (landing craft, mechanized).....	54	June 7, 1943, through Dec. 30, 1944.
RPC (submarine chasers).....	36	Dec. 3, 1943, through Mar. 4, 1944.
Motor launch.....	1	Oct. 19, 1944.
Plane personnel boat.....	1	Mar. 15, 1945.
LCS(S) (landing craft support).....	2	Dec. 30, 1944.
LCVP (landing craft, vehicle, and personnel).....	2	Do.
CR (ice breaker).....	3	Feb. 25, 1944, through Mar. 24, 1945.
250-ton pontoon barges..	4	Jan. 10, 1945, through Oct. 15, 1945.
CL (light cruiser).....	1	Apr. 20, 1944.

With exception of the light cruiser (formerly the U. S. S. *Milwaukee*) all the above-listed craft are subject to return to the United States not later than the termination of the present wars. The light cruiser is on loan to the U. S. S. R. and is subject to return upon implementation of the terms of the Italian peace treaty.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

For the life of me I cannot understand why—and I sought to suggest this 2

weeks ago when the aid to Greece and Turkey was being proposed—we should not adopt legislation calling World War II at an end, so that we would be in a position to demand the return of not only these Navy ships but of planes, tanks, and guns, which we furnished Russia in times past, much of which built it into the powerful nation it now is—a nation whose menace causes grave concern in many quarters.

I would also call the attention of the Members who seem to think that the officers of the Navy who appeared before us are infallible. They are all fine gentlemen. I do not disparage their ability as naval officers a bit. Of course, they are advocates for the Navy and for their Bureau, and they were laboring under a handicap in that they could do nothing but support the President's budget, because they had a letter directing them to support only the President's budget, part of which reads:

When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In view of that word "only," you can well wonder, if an admiral or a captain or a commander should venture to say, "Here is where \$10,000,000 can be saved," how long he would stay on that particular assignment.

Only a year ago this House had to consider the Navy appropriation for 1947. These officers had been before the committee, of which I was not then a member, just as ardently justifying the 1947 budget as they have been the 1948 budget. They told the committee then as they told us now, "This is the irreducible minimum. This is the dollar amount below which you cannot drop and still have this bureau of the Navy operate." Yet if you will refer to House Document No. 66, which has been transmitted to us by the President, you will find requests for transfers in the Navy from various funds to other funds, meaning that, in the first place, if they had had so much appropriated that they could transfer money out, they asked for more than they needed. In the second place, if they had to ask for more in one fund than they had gone to the committee for, they had misjudged their demands at that time.

In this document 66, for instance, there was a request to transfer from the Navy reserve training program \$1,600,000. That is one of the reasons why the Navy reserve program got off to a slow start. It had some of its funds taken from it. That cut was not made by Congress.

There was a request to transfer from Navy Ordnance and Ordnance stores \$2,500,000; from transportation and recruiting of personnel—and incidentally, recruiting is a very minor item although it has a popular appeal—a transfer of \$5,000,000; and from transportation of things, a transfer of \$23,000,000. If they went before the committee and justified that sum from which \$23,000,000 can be deducted, then of course they missed their estimate by \$23,000,000. From

aviation, Navy, in 1947 they asked for another transfer of \$25,000,000, and from Naval Procurement \$169,160,000. In other words, when you total them all up, they asked to transfer \$297,000,000, the amount by which they missed their guesses. No, they are not infallible. They make mistakes just like other people that are human do, and these men are human, surprisingly so. It has been a distinct pleasure to meet many of those officers and to listen to them and know that from the wealth of their experience and the record they piled up during the war, they have done a magnificent job with a magnificent Navy, and that they would in the future be able to maintain with these funds a two-ocean Navy of which any American could well be proud.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation for personal services at the seat of government, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to discuss briefly a subject matter that has already been determined by the House for the purpose of getting into the Record a very important statement which I believe ought to be fully considered when this bill goes to the Senate.

As we all know, we established the so-called Naval ROTC program about 2 years ago. The purpose of the program was to train in the universities of this country about 14,000 young men for service in the line and about 7,000 more in aviation, making a total of about 21,000 men. The intake was supposed to be about three to four thousand men a year. The program started last year. Subsequent to the Appropriation Act of 1947, there was no money available whatever to carry out the purposes of the new Naval ROTC program. They had to resort to a little over a million dollars that was carried over from the old Naval ROTC program to start it, at which time they had planned to take in about 3,100 boys. In order to finish this year they had to get funds from other sources. The only other source available was the Naval Reserve fund. They are now utilizing \$17,900,000 of the Naval Reserve fund in order to carry out the program for 1947. The total cost of the Naval ROTC program this fiscal year 1947 is about \$19,400,000.

The Navy Department put this request in the budget and I believe that the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations has honestly tried to arrive at a proper solution, but because of the involvement in figures and schedules and intake and output and so on, I believe the whole thing has been sort of muddled up.

My only reason for speaking today is to clarify the Record so that when this bill goes to the Senate the \$3,000,000 that has been taken out of the so-called officer training fund for the training of these Naval ROTC boys will be put back into the appropriation. If we do not do that, there is only \$12,000,000 left out of the \$15,000,000 that was recommended, and that will be only sufficient to continue the boys who are now in college, and no boy, not one boy, will be taken into the Naval ROTC program next fall. Already nearly 3,000 boys have been select-

ed and notified of their selection for this training program to start in the fall.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, my only purpose is to call this to the attention of the House and also to the attention of the members of the Committee on Appropriations so that when the bill goes to the Senate the \$3,000,000 will be put back in the bill and these boys who have already been selected will be considered as part of the intake on that program for the Naval ROTC and so that it can be continued as originally intended.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I might call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that we have still to pass upon our organic national-defense legislation which has been pending before the Congress, namely, universal military training as well as other programs. Many of us hesitate to approach the point of universal military training unless it is absolutely essential and in the best interests of our country and unless it is absolutely imperative. I recognize that there are dangers to a democracy in having too large a military establishment. Many of us hesitate to go to that extent, but would unhesitatingly vote for a strong and powerful national-defense law short of that which might, however, include some features of it if necessary. An important part of the national-defense law is our Reserve activity, such as the ROTC; the same in the Army, our National Guard, our opportunities for those in civilian life going to officers' training school, both in the Army and in the Navy; our scientific schools—a strong national defense short of universal military training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. A strong national defense organic law, short of universal military training, seems to me would call for something being done as far as the Naval ROTC is concerned, along the lines to which the gentleman has referred. I join with the gentleman in the expression that the committee did the best it could under the circumstances and probably with the evidence before it. I hope that the additional evidence necessary to satisfy the Senate will be obtained between now and the time the committee holds hearings over there, and when the bill comes to conference the very able and pointed matter that the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred to will be taken care of.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wish to say I have already spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and also other members of the committee and they say very definitely that they are entirely in sympathy with the continuation of the Naval ROTC program. If they can be shown there is need for the money, they will give it their wholehearted support. My only purpose in taking the floor is so that this matter

may be called to the attention of the Senate and provision made for these 3,000 new boys who will be taken in this fall.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There have been several comments on the floor this afternoon criticizing the personnel of the Navy, some of which were rather caustic. I would like to know how any Member of this House, the Senate, or any other place in Government, can hold the Navy and the Army responsible with the kind of potential legislation that is pending around here to tear the military departments to pieces. It would seem to me they should be congratulated rather than criticized and I am getting tired of listening to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am sorry to hear in this discussion any criticism of our naval officers. I have been a member of the Naval Affairs Committee nearly 11 years, and I want to say that we are dealing with the highest type of men, who are ready and willing and on the alert at any time to give their lives, if necessary, as they have done down through the last 5 years, in order to safeguard the welfare of this country and the peace of the world. Certainly I do not countenance any criticism of our naval officers in respect to their activities and what they are doing in the interest of this country. I know them too well.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. While I am not satisfied with the selection of the men for the ROTC, it is a good proposition. There have been a number of boys selected from my district but in my own city of Lowell, Mass., which gave more men after Pearl Harbor up to August 1 than any other city of comparable size, although a very fine young man passed at Lowell, he was not selected. I think that was true also of Lawrence. I think the selection is bad, but the idea is splendid.

I want to ask the gentleman if this is not true: That today the Navy Department is more or less gagged? It does not fight for itself today as it should?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, I believe that is true. I find it on every appropriation matter coming up here, or any other matter dealing with the Navy, that their voice is stifled by higher authorities, which does not permit them to express their own convictions before committees of this House. I say we have reached a sad situation when we cannot have our representatives in the Navy and the Army come before the Congress of the United States and express themselves as they would like to be understood, only because a gag has been placed upon them. The reason we have instituted this so-called ROTC program is because we did not see fit to expand the Naval Academy to the dimensions necessary in order to train 3,000 more officers. Instead of that we have selected something like 60 different universities throughout the country for the program

in order to train 14,000 officers which are so essential to the Navy as we face an uncertain future. It is only because we did not expand the Naval Academy that we have to resort to the so-called NROTC program to train the boys to meet the conditions we are bound to face in the modern world with all the scientific methods now being used in world-wide warfare.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations of the House will call to the attention of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate the fact that this deficiency denies any of these funds and practically puts a stop entirely to the induction of approximately 2,700 young men into the naval ROTC program for 1948.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I am extremely interested in the reserve components of both the Army and the Navy. I appreciate the splendid job that has been done by this committee. I know, and the committee knows, that the efficiency of an army or a navy is not necessarily in direct proportion to the amount of money you appropriate to it. In fact, if you appropriate enough to pay three men to do a job which reasonably requires only one, you break down that efficiency and the morale. But in view of the developments that have taken place since the beginning of the hearings on this bill, I would like to ask the members of the committee whether they have considered the question of the set-up of our Navy and our Army—Navy in this instance—with relation to events that have taken place beginning with and since the speech of the President on March 12, with its tremendous implications, the passage in this House and in the Senate of H. R. 2616 known as the Greek-Turkish aid bill, with its authorization of an appropriation of \$400,000,000, which will be largely used for military purposes, as announced, and the undenied reports that more appropriations will be asked for other foreign governments, all alleged to be for the purpose of stopping communism, together with the future implications of the so-called Truman doctrine throughout the world, particularly since we are told in the press that Great Britain is now asking us to take over the defenses of the Suez Canal. Have the members of the committee taken those things into consideration in the laying down of our policy so far as the Navy is concerned? I am seriously concerned about it, seriously concerned. My training has taught me that a nation's military and naval policy must depend upon its foreign policy, because it is the military and naval force that is used to carry out that foreign policy.

We would better, it seems to me, first determine how far we are going in this foreign policy, if it can be called a foreign policy, and then determine what we need in the way of an army and a navy to support it. Suppose communism does not want to be stopped. Then, if it does not, and we are going to stop it, the first sensible question which arises is, What with?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in carrying out the unrestrained and limitless Truman doctrine we will not just make appropriations to involve us in difficulties from which it will require more and more appropriations for our Army and Navy to extricate ourselves.

I want to sound the warning that if we keep on as we have started we will again be caught unprepared, because we are waiting to find out where an unlimited foreign policy will take us before we figure out and supply the means to carry it out. I know of no nation in history which followed any such foreign policy with success. The sensible way is to first settle upon our reasonably attainable objectives and then prepare to supply the means to attain them before we plunge after them.

In any event I should like to see the appropriation for the naval reserve training program restored, so that the functions of the program may be carried out, inasmuch as examinations have to be held and preliminary work has to be done before these boys enter the colleges in the fall of the year. I do hope that this may be taken up in the Senate and that the conference report will contain proper provisions to carry out that program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the committee has carefully considered the various items in this appropriation bill, but I am fearful that the passage of this bill in its present form may seriously impair the effectiveness of our Navy.

It has been said on this floor today that the recommended cut in appropriations for Navy personnel will cause a reduction in strength to a total of 355,000 men. This is 70,000 below the figure which we have been considering as a reasonably safe minimum. If we do not provide the funds for the pay and subsistence of enlisted men and officers, the Navy must naturally curtail its personnel. In addition to curtailment in funds for personnel, the bill contains drastic reductions for the maintenance of our ships. I am tremendously disturbed about this.

In these turbulent times when we cannot foresee the outcome of international negotiations—when we cannot tell whether the peace will be maintained or how soon we may have another war—in times such as these we cannot afford to take risks with our national defense establishments. I am convinced that a strong Navy and a strong Army are our best insurance against war—at least until such time as an international organization capable of preserving peace is finally established.

I am thoroughly in accord with efforts to accomplish governmental economy, and frankly I believe economies can and should be made in the Navy Department. There are many evidences of steps which the Navy Department is taking to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful practices. In times like these, while we need to reduce expenditures, we can ill afford to take the chances involved by the drastic reductions proposed in this bill.

Until world conditions become more settled, we should not let our quest for

economy blind us to the utter necessity for maintaining adequate defense. It is easily possible that the spending of a few dollars now for maintaining our ships and properly manning them might discourage any would-be aggressor and save us from another war with its attendant cost in human life and suffering, as well as in money.

The fighting forces of our Nation are today the best assurance of peace. Let us not gamble with our Nation's security. There is need for greater efficiency but let us be sure that in promoting efficiency we shall not relinquish mastery of the seas or jeopardize our ability to cope with any potential enemies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Naval Records and Library, \$50,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 25, line 19, after the comma, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$92,000."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase the appropriation of \$50,000, approved by the committee, to the sum of \$92,000, or an increase of \$42,000. It concerns the Office of Naval Records and Library of the Navy Department. Those of us who had the good privilege of serving in the Navy know the value of records. Every single operation that took place in this last war can be found among the records of the Navy Department, if they are properly filed.

It is the duty of the Office of Naval Records and Library to not only file these records but keep them and make them available to those who plan the Navy of the future. The Navy Department at the moment is involved in a study of a revision of ships to meet the new age of warfare; and to make that study complete, the records of World War II will have to be made available. It is common knowledge that the Office of Naval Records and Library has a backlog that will require months and months of effort to prepare the records of World War II and properly file them. The item of \$50,000 approved by the committee will provide the Office of Naval Records and Library with 20 persons, a number inadequate to do the job. My amendment, which increases the amount to \$92,000, will provide 32 persons, the number necessary to do the job properly.

Mr. Chairman, we should maintain an adequate Navy to protect the interests of our Government and its people. I believe that economy is necessary at all times in maintaining that type of a navy. I further believe that we should not practice economy in a department of the Navy where the records are assembled and kept ready for the use of those who look into the future and plan the type of navy necessary to protect the security of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore ask the approval of my amendment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the subcommittee had no intention of injuring the

work or crippling the activities of this small department of the Navy; however, it should be called to the attention of the committee in opposing this amendment that the gentleman offers to give the Navy for this small department of Records and Library \$92,000, while all they asked for was \$65,000. I must confess that I have never seen the Navy timid when it comes to asking for money for any of its departments. Last year they had \$57,000, and the current cost of running that little department amounts to about \$4,000 a month, or \$48,000 a year. We have given them \$2,000 more than that. Further, may I say that if they do get into any cramped period there is always additional Navy personnel that can be brought in for a short time to help them over the hump.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] made mention of gags applied to certain officers of the Navy. It is possible that the officer concerned may have been gagged; however, they do talk to their friends at times.

Mr. PLOESER. I know, and I will admit that there are probably times when they have been gagged. Certainly, in the discussion of this great question of unification of the armed forces there was an obvious gag put on the Navy, in my opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this bill has been discussed on a very fine, high plane, and I have been amazed and very sorry to see the even and smooth operation of it through the House disturbed by the injection of what might be considered to be partisan politics. I might say for the gentleman's benefit that the other day when Admiral Nimitz was before the Committee on Expenditures, which I have the honor to be a member of, under a great chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—

Mr. PLOESER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the intimation was made. I asked Admiral Nimitz if there was anybody that censored him. And he said, "No," there has been no censoring, so let us forget the gag and go ahead on the high level we have been proceeding on.

Mr. PLOESER. I merely acknowledge from what I have observed from experience, I did not know the Navy ever entered into partisan politics, nor did I know that the administration's advocacy of unification of the services was put on a partisan basis. That was the first time I learned that. But, I must assume that the whip of the minority knows what he is talking about and if it is on a partisan basis I presume we should approach it from a different angle.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman misinterprets my statement.

Mr. PLOESER. I said nothing about partisanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. My reference to partisanship was in reference to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in picking up and quoting the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] so that the gentleman had a lapse of memory for a few minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, the gentleman recognizes the fact that neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor I mentioned partisanship.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman used the word "gag."

Mr. PLOESER. Does "gag" mean "partisanship?" We do not consider it in our operations on this side of the aisle.

Mr. McCORMACK. Ah, the gentleman is very naive.

Mr. PLOESER. It is a word coined by the minority party, I presume, because we do not consider the term "gag" a part of our operation.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we get into that, what about fear?

Mr. PLOESER. Fear, as the gentleman plainly see, we never have.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Who?

Mr. PLOESER. The majority.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means the minority.

Mr. PLOESER. No. I would say the minority frequently gives me the impression that they are operating from fear.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that a memorandum went to the heads of all departments of Government, signed by the President of the United States, directing that no one would dare take opposition or disagree with the budget proposals of the Administration. I am referring to the following memorandum:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, November 15, 1946.

Memorandum for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have noticed that on several occasions certain department and agency officials have shown a tendency to seek from Congress larger appropriations than were contemplated in official budget estimates.

The estimates which I transmit to Congress reflect a balanced program for the executive branch as a whole, and each individual estimate is considered in the light of this program, its relationship to other estimates, and the fiscal position of the Government. While agency witnesses before congressional committees must feel free to supply facts in answer to questions of committee members, I cannot condone the practice of seizing upon any opportunity which presents itself to indicate an opinion, either directly or indirectly, that my estimates are insufficient.

When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities, I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. PLOESER. I must honestly answer the gentleman that I have been told that on numerous occasions. Such a letter of instruction defeats honest budgeting.

Now, let me say that the subcommittee has to oppose this amendment, because we think we have made an adequate allowance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Maritime Commission has about 250 war-built tankers still remaining in its possession which are unsold. At the present time the Maritime Commission is seeking legislation for the chartering of tankers. Since the end of hostilities, the Navy has turned back as surplus to the Maritime Commission 46 tankers, saying the Navy does not need tankers; that they are surplus; 16 of which have been turned back since the 30th day of June, 1946. There are 250 tankers now in control of the Maritime Commission which it is unable to sell, and the American-flag operators say that they own and have purchased all they need for domestic operation.

The Navy has appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine urging that new legislation be enacted to give the Maritime Commission authority to charter these 250 unsold tankers, including the 46 the Navy turned back saying that it did not need them. The Navy says it has secured from the Appropriations Committee, the sum of \$17,300,000 so that it might charter the very tankers it turned back as not needed. There is no explanation in the hearings with reference to the fact that the Navy turned back 46 tankers. The Navy did not tell the Appropriations Committee, "We want \$17,300,000 to charter the very tankers we turned back."

The Navy in a statement before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on Thursday, May 15, stated that it needs 20 tankers to be chartered for the fiscal year 1948, and that it secured \$17,300,000 in this appropriation bill for such chartering of tankers. I do not think that appropriation was secured fairly. There is no such explanation in the hearings. From the hearing on Thursday last before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries it first became known that the Navy is urging this legislation so that it might spend \$17,300,000 to charter the very tankers the Navy turned over to the Maritime Commission as surplus. I believe this sum of \$17,300,000 should be taken away from the Navy. The Navy should not be given \$17,300,000 to charter the very tankers it turned back as surplus, for at the very time and even now it can secure at no cost, the 250 tankers in the possession of the Maritime Commission and unsold. All the Navy has to do is operate them. They do not have to pay \$17,300,000 to secure these 250 surplus tankers. However, this was covered up in the hearings by the Navy and I believe it should be taken up in conference, and that \$17,300,000 should be taken out of the appropriation of \$55,000,000 set forth on page 15, line 23, of the bill and described on pages 1225, 1226, and 1227 of the hearings under H. R. 3493.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rose and asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of correcting a statement he made, that the Navy had not stated this to the subcommittee, because it did. Every member that is on this subcommittee can verify that statement.

Mr. WEICHEL. Did the Navy in asking for the \$17,300,000 to charter tankers, tell the committee that the Navy had no use for 46 tankers that it turned over to the Maritime Commission as surplus within the last 15 months, and that the Navy now will need to charter 24 tankers. If the Navy told the committee all that, would you still give the Navy \$17,300,000 to charter the very same tankers that it gave up to the Maritime Commission as surplus, while at the same time the Navy can secure all the tankers it needs without cost from the Maritime Commission who has 250 unsold tankers on hand.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to answer the gentleman from Ohio, to tell him that this matter of chartering tankers was discussed. My recollection is that they did not say anything about having turned back to any agency any number of tankers, but I went into it thoroughly to determine why, with the number of men they have in the Navy, the Navy could not operate these tankers. We were told that they do operate some tankers themselves but that the \$17,000,000 which they sought for charter hire was a figure less than that for which they could operate tankers for themselves. I discussed that particular question and we were informed that due to the method under which the Navy operates their tankers it takes a much larger crew than it does in the civil lines, whether it be the merchant marine or private tanker, and that it is cheaper for them to charter tankers to haul oil and fuel than it is to operate them with Navy crews.

They did point out that during the war they operated tankers, fleet fuelers, and all of that, and that in view of the situation along the coast where there was no regularly maintained chartered tanker line they made short hauls themselves. We asked them whether or not there could be some training value for the personnel of the Navy in operating tankers. We were assured there could not be and that the method which they were seeking to follow resulted in the saving of dollars for the American taxpayer.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. In testimony by the Navy they admitted that in securing these tankers without cost from the Maritime Commission if they did not have to pay for the replacements it would be cheaper. We have 250 tankers that we have no purchasers for. So if the Navy has them and operates them and does not have to make replacements for them, it certainly would be cheaper. They did say that.

They also testified with reference to the crews. On a merchant tanker the crew is about 60 whereas the Navy uses 120 for the same operation. But they point out that with that 120-man crew they keep up the repairs and maintenance which they do not do on merchant tankers. They admit they are cheaper if they do not have to pay for the replacements.

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I say in view of some of the statements that have been made this morning you will find confirmation of the fact that I looked at many of these items with a very cold and fishy eye. Those who were present before the committee will tell you they had to prove what they said to me. In this one particular instance they convinced me that they were right and that it was more feasible to charter these tankers, as they propose doing, than it was to operate them by Navy personnel.

If the gentleman has some information which is contrary to that, the facts should be given to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and then possibly that can be cleared up in the hearings in the Senate and if necessary worked out in conference.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I corroborate the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas who conducted the larger part of the examination of witnesses with respect to the matter under discussion. His memory corresponds to mine, and I know with that of other members of the committee who are around me.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the hour, and in view of the fact that there is only one other amendment on the Clerk's desk, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee several questions?

First, I would like to know whether or not he has given the Navy every dollar they could justify.

Mr. PLUMLEY. And a little more.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And is the chairman of the subcommittee satisfied that the amount of money allocated to the Navy will give to the American people the type of navy necessary to protect their interests?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Were it not so, your subcommittee would not have brought in the bill it did.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts in regard to the inadequacy of the Naval Academy and the shortage of commissioned personnel at the commencement of this war. As

many of you know, I graduated from the Naval Academy some 40 years ago. This spring we will have our fortieth reunion. We observe it at Annapolis next Saturday. So what I say about the Naval Academy I can say with good grace.

The Naval Academy is a fine school. It is one of the best. It does not need to take a back seat when compared to any other organization. Its graduates, I think, have been a credit to us throughout the world. However, there is nothing sacred about the Naval Academy. I have always believed there should be other ways of getting into the commissioned ranks than having to go through the Naval Academy and without having to get an appointment from a Senator or a Congressman. I believe the Navy would be better off if it took in, with reasonable safeguards, a reasonable number of graduates of colleges in the United States. I think that the proposed system, the system we are trying to build up, by which a certain number of ROTC graduates from accredited colleges are to be given commissions in the Navy, and then in a few years to go to a postgraduate school together with the regular graduates of the Naval Academy, will be for the best interests of the Nation.

We are trying to establish such a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., as you know. I have every hope that, rather than attempting to expand the facilities at the Naval Academy, at Annapolis, which I consider already very much congested, this House will support the efforts of the Navy Department to establish an adequate postgraduate school in California. We can thereby increase the number of our naval officers, have them all of the same kind, and, I hope, have them all representative Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 28, line 11, after the semicolon and following the word "employee" add the following: "No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this matter up with the committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Unless there is objection on the part of the minority, as far as our side is concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The minority accepts the ruling of the chairman of the committee most humbly and most acceptably.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That will save us a speech from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in one to include an editorial.

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert therein an article from the Lowell Sun bearing on the question of unification.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

LABOR-RELATIONS BILL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the labor bill recently passed by

the other body, though not ideal, is a more equitable bill than the one passed by the House. Unlike the House bill, it does not authorize private employers to obtain injunctions, and it leaves the difficult and delicate problem of industry-wide bargaining for further study. Furthermore, it safeguards but does not prohibit employer contributions to union welfare funds.

It is my hope that the House conferees will see fit to accept the substance of the Senate bill. In my opinion, such a bill has a far better chance of becoming law. In the interests both of the workers and the general public it is important that some legislation on this vital problem should become law during this session.

S. 814 IMPERILS THE WHOLE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this irresponsible piece of legislation must be defeated.

Coming at a time when prices have nearly reached the breaking point, this inflationary measure may well touch off the collapse in one industry which, spreading like a contagion to others, may plunge us into a swift deflation and a ruinous depression.

Already the demand for worsted goods is beginning to ease up. The artificial jacking up of prices embodied in this bill, could not come at a worse time for the industry. The provision to increase import duties on wool up to 50 percent ad valorem without notice or hearing, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, would totally disrupt the cost estimates of manufacturers. The inevitable result would be the cutting of production to a minimum, when the cry is for more and more production. This bill would put the textile industry out on a limb. The only protection for the manufacturers would be curtailment of all activities, causing loss of income and widespread unemployment.

In the New England States, textiles provide 4 out of every 10 jobs. In my home city of Lawrence, the largest producer of worsteds in the world, the industry provides 7 out of every 10 jobs. We are in no mood to stand idly by and permit the basic element in our economy to be destroyed by the wool-raiding lobby. If the woolen and worsted industries curtail production, as they certainly will if faced with this confiscatory tariff, the wool-growers of the United States will also lose.

The extremes to which S. 814 goes, has all the earmarks of a conspiracy to profit a few, at a disastrous cost to many.

At first glance, the extra preferences granted to the wool farmers may appear attractive to them. I give them sober warning, however, that this bill will prove to be a boomerang. If you paralyze the textile industry, you will be cutting off the market for your wool. And you cannot expect the Government to go on buying your product at a highly inflated

level, when it can only dispose of it at a loss. These are totalitarian methods. They will not work and they will not be endured.

Let us face the facts honestly.

Our domestic wool crop was never able to supply more than half of the raw material needs of our manufacturers. In addition, it could not provide the long-fiber raw wool necessary for quality worsteds. Shall the manufacturers and the consumers of the Nation be penalized for this? That, precisely, will be the net result if S. 814 should be approved by this House. In essence it says: "Take my limited product at prices held high above real market value or take none at all." In effect, it is monopolistic and dangerous.

Wool needs some support. Every fair-minded person will agree with this. But when the growers seek preferences far above the bulk of all other agricultural items, their case loses ground. Ninety percent of parity is good enough insurance for any commodity. Parity is a Government index of farm-operation costs, similar to the cost-of-living index. But wool wants to be the prodigal son, getting a guaranty of 100 percent. Furthermore, they want this guaranty to hold through 1947-48, when prices in a free market are bound to come down. S. 814 would fix the price of wool for 2 years at over 100 percent of today's high parity, and could be 130 percent or more should parity drop to wartime levels, which is inevitable.

The workers in the textile industry are feeling the high cost of living because their wages have not kept pace with costs. They know that the prices of agricultural commodities, as a group, have gone higher than any others. Why wool should be seeking a support price still higher than it has enjoyed, is beyond their common-sense understanding. They are unanimously opposed to S. 814.

The Government is already stuck with a 400,000,000-pound wool surplus which it cannot get rid of. On this program, to date, it has lost over \$38,000,000. It seems very strange to me that Members of the so-called economy party in Congress should be working to have the Government drop another \$100,000,000 through indirect subsidies to wool farmers by outright Government purchase of the 1947 and 1948 wool production in the United States, and at the highest prices over a 27-year period. It is also a striking contradiction of their oft-expressed determination to get the Government out of business. For S. 814 means the nationalization of the raw-wool industry.

The House Agricultural Committee has inserted in the bill a provision directing the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he finds cause, to impose an import fee above the present duty, after the duty has been paid, and also allows him to impose a floor tax at the time of withdrawal of wool from bonded warehouses. The temptation to do this stems from the fact that the Government already has a huge wool surplus. The textile industry needs long-fiber imported wool. Putting on the new import fee would drive import-wool prices up and would add a dollar to the price of 75,000,000 wool garments bought annually by Americans.

The effect on manufacturers would be disastrous. In the woolen-worsted industry, prices and orders are taken twice a year—in the spring and in the fall. If, after making a sale at a stated price, the manufacturer is confronted with the fact of additional import fees and floor taxes imposed suddenly by the Secretary of Agriculture, he will be forced into bankruptcy. In this capricious set-up, free enterprise would be choked to death.

The critical need of our Nation is for more production, so that supply may catch up with demand and result in a gradual reduction in prices. The remedy for the danger which exists is not to price an industry out of business.

We, from the manufacturing areas, recognize that the domestic growers of wool are entitled to some price support. In a spirit of cooperation, we ask that they, in turn, consider our problem.

The woolen and worsted industry cannot survive the drastic penalties imposed by S. 814.

Wool growers, manufacturers, textile workers, and consumers are partners in an enterprise. They must not become antagonists because all of them will suffer.

In place of the extreme provisions of S. 814, we suggest that you join with us in supporting the moderate Herter bill, which gives due consideration to all factors in the problem. This will give Government support at 90 percent of parity to the wool growers, in line with other agricultural commodities. It will take the Government out of the wool business, where its record has been a costly failure. It will restore private incentive to the industry and protect tens of thousands of people from losing their jobs. It will bank and not fan the fires of inflation.

The wool growers already enjoy a generous tariff protection. The wool farmers are prosperous, and in this respect let it be noticed that 90 percent of the domestic wool supply is processed in the manufacturing plants in the Northeastern States and about three-quarters of the lamb crop is consumed in this area. It is hardly the best policy for the wool growers to bite the hand that feeds them.

Nor would it be wisdom on our part to fight against price support for wool.

The only reasonable course for all of us to follow is to enact legislation similar to the Herter bill, which is fair to all parties concerned.

S. 814 as amended by the Rules Committee of the House is discriminatory and inflationary. In the national interest, it must be defeated.

BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,

May 16, 1947.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As representing most of the wool merchants of the country, including the National Wool Trade Association and the Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, I ask you very earnestly to give your attention to the enclosed brief which covers S. 814, the wool bill which is about to reach the floor of the House.

It happens that three-fourths of all the woolen and worsted mills are within a 300-

mile radius of Boston—hence this is the center of distribution of the raw wool of the country.

For generations, our merchants have been performing their function of going West each spring and summer, buying wool from the growers competitively, bringing it East for storage, grading, and preparing according to the needs of each manufacturer, and selling it gradually as the mills may want it for their various yarns and fabrics. This bill S. 814 would have the Government take over our business.

For war reasons, in 1943 it was necessary for the Government to purchase all domestic wool, but we expected our business to be returned at the cessation of hostilities. Bill S. 814 sponsored by Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming and Representative HOPE of Kansas provides for the continuance of Government purchases for at least two more years. Normally the handling of domestic wool comprises three-fourths of our business, and we have a right to expect the Government to permit a return to free enterprise.

The wool business is intricate and a technical one, but we have tried to summarize our case very briefly as per enclosure. Should you desire more detailed facts and figures, we will be pleased to forward them at once. Having no organized lobby working in our behalf, this is the only way of bringing our case to the Members of your legislative body.

Thanking you for your consideration, and asking for your assistance in this matter, I am
Sincerely yours,

HARRY A. TILTON,

President, Boston Wool Trade Association.

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE WOOL MERCHANTS, IN OPPOSITION TO ENACTMENT OF S. 814

A. S. 814 is a denial of free enterprise to the wool distribution industry:

1. S. 814 compels Government purchase or loan on United States wool at 42.3 cents a pound (by agreed definition of 1946 support level).

2. The market price of United States wool is not over 38 cents (fact not disputed by any party).

3. By paying above the market price the Government excludes all competitive merchants from their livelihood, and nationalizes the industry.

B. S. 814 is very costly to the United States Treasury:

1. S. 814 authorizes the Government to sell the wool at market value.

2. At the present market value, which is the highest of any peacetime year since 1923, the loss under S. 814 on selling the 1947-48 wool figures to be at least \$30,000,000, plus minimum costs for storage, handling, administration, etc., of \$10,000,000—or \$40,000,000 certain loss to the taxpayers.

3. Should market value decline 20 percent the loss under S. 814 would be sixty million additional or one hundred million total.

4. The above is in addition to losses of thirty-seven million realized loss and fifty-five million anticipated by CCC to be lost on its wool operations to date.

C. S. 814 provides an indirect subsidy to sheep farmers that is totally unnecessary:

1. Sheep farmers produce annually more than 6 pounds of meat (mostly lamb) to every single pound of wool. Wool is incidental to the sheep operation.

2. Lamb prices today are 250 percent of prewar normal (1921-40). Today 20 cents against normal 8 cents. Wool prices are 140 percent of prewar normal. Today 38 cents against normal 27 cents. (Figures from United States Department of Agriculture).

3. Thus the over-all income of the sheep farmer is by official figures shown to be over 230 percent of normal (6 times 250 percent plus 1 times 140 percent averaged equal 230 percent). This is one of the highest increases of income of any class of citizens of our country. The sheep operation certainly

does not now require subsidization from the United States Treasury.

4. If United States sheep population has declined, as it has since 1942, it is because the operators have been influenced by these high prices to sell their "seed-corn," i. e., their ewe lambs, and by intent have reduced their flocks. A similar thing happened from 1926 to 1931, when production rose 50 percent while prices declined 50 percent. It is normal in the sheep industry for production to rise when prices fall and for production to decline when prices rise.

5. Not a single individual case of farmer financial hardship was disclosed at the hearings on this bill.

Summary: S. 814 is not good legislation.

It does not get the Government out of business.

It increases taxes.

It subsidizes a segment of our economy that is in fact very prosperous.

It liquidates a class of skilled free-enterprise wool merchants and substitutes a Government bureaucracy in their place.

ADDENDA

Because S. 814 is not sound legislation it should not pass as written. This is not to say, however, that no wool legislation is in order.

Corn, wheat, tobacco, potatoes, hogs, and in fact, most agricultural products have been favored by a Government guaranty of a floor price during 1947-48 of 90 percent of parity. Wool has no such guaranty. We think that wool is equally entitled to such a guaranty and understand that Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER will submit substitute legislation to this end. Ninety percent of parity is probably the limit within which private enterprise can function without the Government having to operate the market (as has happened recently to potatoes) and suffer tremendous losses.

Also there is an enabling law needed for the disposal of the Government war surplus of wool which cannot now legally be sold under 100 percent of parity. This is also covered in the Herter legislation, to enable selling the surplus at market.

These two points are all the legislation needed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, for the purpose of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

698. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case of 191 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3308. A bill to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3516. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1260. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; with an amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1274. A bill to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2947. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; with an amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3151. A bill to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; with an amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3348. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella Division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3350. A bill relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 325. A bill to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1893. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3527. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3528. A bill to increase the rates of certain educational and readjustment allowances payable to veterans in order to compensate for the higher cost of living in Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3529. A bill prohibiting members of certain subversive organizations from being members of any labor organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3530. A bill to provide percentage depletion in the case of beryl, feldspar, mica, lepidolite, spodumene, bentonite, and ambligonite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3531. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit State and Territorial labor relations boards to exercise jurisdiction in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3532. A bill to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to powers of appointment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 3534. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in southwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 3535. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a housing project at Kingsville, Tex., known as Retama Park, to the housing authority of the city of Kingsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3536. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for law-enforcement officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who have rendered at least 20 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3537. A bill to authorize the participation of States in certain revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 3538. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3539. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3540. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical care and treatment of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service furnished other than by activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3541. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3542. A bill relating to eligibility for interment in Veterans' Administration cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3543. A bill to permit personnel of tugboats on the Great Lakes to work over 8 hours in 1 day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3544. A bill to provide for payment by the United States of premiums on bonds given to the United States by persons employed in the field or departmental service of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3545. A bill to amend title 11 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL (by request):

H. R. 3546. A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain ex-service organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3547. A bill to authorize funds for ceremonies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3548. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public-health program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the month of June 1947 as Remember-Disabled-Veterans Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for a continuation of the school-lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide by an amendment to any merger bill, making such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve our country; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Louise Benedict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Carl O. Young, Clifford L. Godfrey, and R. A. Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3552. A bill granting to Frank S. Howell certain pay and allowances for his travel from the Philippine Islands to the United States following his discharge from the Army in such islands in 1900; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 3553. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

534. By Mr. BRADLEY of California: Petition of Rev. Rollo E. Dunham and 94 other citizens of Long Beach, Calif., and vicinity, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

535. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legislative session that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the commission of Christian relations, diocese of New York, urging adoption of the plan to admit up to 400,000 displaced persons by reopening unused immigration quotas back to 1940 and allowing quotas to be transferable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. Also, petition of the commission on Christian social relations, diocese of New York, urging Congress to enact legislation to bring within the coverage of the Federal laws providing for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, lay employees of religious organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

538. Also, petition of the commission on Christian social relations, diocese of New York, urging enactment of the Taft-Ellender-

Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

539. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition submitted by the West Towns (Ill.) Chapter, No. 22, of the Disabled American Veterans, petitioning the Congress to revise the present statutes to provide additional pension benefits for veterans suffering from service-connected tuberculosis (resolution submitted by George Walker, commander of DAV Post No. 22); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

540. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-third legislative session, urging that the existence of the Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

541. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition by a group of residents of Brodhead, Wis., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

542. Also, resolution adopted by Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Kenosha, Wis., in support of S. 715, which provides annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

543. Also, resolution by Kenosha district, Zionist Organization of America, Kenosha, Wis., calling upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative in the General Assembly of the United Nations to champion the cause of the Jews in Palestine, and insist that the Jewish people through the Jewish agency be accorded representation in all deliberations within the United Nations regarding Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

544. Also, resolution adopted by Local No. 557, Kenosha Teachers Union, Kenosha, Wis., calling upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative in the General Assembly of the United Nations to champion the cause of the Jews in Palestine, and insist that the Jewish people through the Jewish agency be accorded representation in all deliberations within the United Nations regarding Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

545. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Ann's Holy Name Society of Indiana, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly, within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

546. Also, petition of Knebba County of Foresters, No. 1677, of St. Luke's parish, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of subversive activities of foreign agents working directly or indirectly within or without the continental United States, tending to break down constitutional government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

547. Also, petition of Augustin-Ewing Post, No. 2095, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Baton Rouge, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment into law of H. R. 501; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

548. Also, petition of Delta Council, of Stoneville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to protect the laborer, employer, and public against unwarranted encroachment upon their rights and personal liberties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.